

AMERICAN SLAVERY,

IN ITS

MORAL AND POLITICAL ASPECTS,

COMPREHENSIVELY EXAMINED;

TO WHICH

IS SUBJOINED AN EPITOME OF

ECCEASTASTICAL HISTORY,

SHEWING THE

MUTILATED STATE OF

MODERN CHRISTIANITY,

BY

JAMES BROWN.

"Truth, crushed to earth, will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers."

"And can a caucus with a nod,
Suspend the law of Love?
Or votes on this created clod,
Dethrone the powers above?"

PRINTED BY GEO. HENRY, OSWEGO,

1840.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1840, by JAMES
BROWN, in the Clerk's Office of the Northern District of New-York.

1840

1840

1840

TO THE READER.

It is alike due the reader and the writer of the following pages, to explain that they have grown to their present form and size without an original plan. Mr. Clay's speech in the Senate last winter, gave the author an inviting text book, to express, in the form of a review, his own sentiments and opinions. He availed of the occasion to do so, through the rare and liberal indulgence of the three political papers of the village of Oswego, and was thereby enabled, in a series of numbers, written under the signature of PHILAETHES, (a lover of truth,) to provoke the readers of these papers to a manly debate of the principles and measures of the American Anti Slavery Society. The writer failed in drawing out such a discussion as he anticipated, and nothing was educed in the shape of controversial dispute, but what is sufficiently noticed and explained in the review itself, to enable the reader to judge of its character and bearing. Shortly after completing the numbers of the review, a resolution was adopted at a mass meeting of the abolitionists of Oswego County, that they be published in a pamphlet form. In complying with this request, the writer, in order to render the work more complete in its moral aspect, appended the Chapter showing the dereliction of the American Church from its responsibilities on this subject, and while writing that Chapter, it occurred to him that the root of the controversy between political abolitionists and their opponents, shot deeper, and had a wider circuit than had yet been explored. This induced him to sketch, in the concluding Chapter, the origin and history of what he considers a heresy of mountainous dimensions, with which Christianity has been afflicted since the days of Constantine.

With this explanation of the somewhat architectural style in which this work is put together, the author has no apologies to make to the public, nor any indulgence to crave of the pen or the tongue of the severest criticism. He puts his proper name on the title page; not certainly to give weight to the doctrines advanced, for this humble work is the Alpha, and will, he presumes, be the Omega of his authorship; but with a view of yielding to the public that justice which he considers due them, from the professed lover of truth in its undisguised simplicity, and of identifying what little personal responsibility he may possess, with the injurious tendencies which he doubts not many honest, but indolent minds will deem the work instrumental in effecting.

PREFACE.

After witnessing the fate of other productions of a similar kind, the author has no vanity to mortify, if in the present state of the political, religious, and literary press of his country, this work, (even if it appeared in a less homely dress,) should fail to meet with that intellectual grappling of mind with mind in generous strife, which it covets, and which the magnitude of its subject demands of every devoted
LOVER OF TRUTH.

THE AUTHOR.

Oswego, February, 1840.

ALBANY
1840
Y. B. 1841

REVIEW
OF
MR. CLAY'S SPEECH
ON
SLAVERY.

NO. I.

MR. EDITOR,—I propose through the medium of your paper, to examine, in a series of communications, as I may find time and opportunity to prepare them, the speech of Henry Clay, of Kentucky, lately made in the Senate of the United States, on the subject of American Slavery. My object in doing this is two-fold. First, because Mr. Clay stands before the American public as the contemplated candidate for the exalted office of chief magistrate of this nation, and it consequently becomes a matter of public concernment that his avowed political doctrines should be brought in contact with the touchstone of moral truth, of democratic principle, and of constitutional law. In connection with this object, I am desirous of inviting public attention to the principles themselves with which he stands identified in this speech, believing as I do that they have not received that attention which they deserve, and that free and temperate discussion is the only legitimate mode of correcting public opinion which can or ought to be recognized by a free people. In the exercise of the license to do so through the columns of your press, (a favor which is highly appreciated and gratefully acknowledged,) I may probably express sentiments with which you or some of your readers do not concur. In that event I expect to be arraigned at the bar of received truth, as built upon the inductive philosophy of Bacon, and tested in the crucible of his *novum organon*. To the decision of this tribunal, I trust it will ever be with me a duty as pleasing as it is imperious to bow with reverential submission.

The occasion embraced by Mr. Clay, for the delivery of this speech, was the presentment by him of a petition from the inhabitants of the District of Columbia, praying against the abolition of slavery in that District, and against the action of Congress upon the abolition petitions with which their two Houses were then flooded. It is said by a Washington correspondent that

this petition was concocted in the office of Gales & Seaton, and got up by his political adherents at Washington, on purpose to furnish him an opportunity of laying his views before the public preparatory to the presidential election. However this may be, the occasion was evidently sought by him, and yielded by the Senate rather through personal courtesy than by strict parliamentary right, of making an avowal to his political friends both at the north and south, of his opinions concerning slavery. How far he has succeeded in ingratiating southern popularity by this speech is not my purpose to inquire; but I propose to show that on the north side of Mason & Dixon's line at least, his doctrines must be revulsive to the moral sentiments and political principles of all parties; that there is, aside from the intrinsic difficulties against which the advocate of slavery has to contend, a studied and lurking evasion of principle, perversion of facts and vacillation of purpose, which are alike demeaning to the man, unworthy of the senator, and disparaging to the presidential candidate.

Mr. Clay, after premising that the course he would desire to take with anti-slavery petitions, would be to receive and refer them, and "*in a calm and dispassionate and argumentative appeal to the good sense of the whole community,*" report against them, proposes to set forth in his speech such topics as he thinks should be embodied in such report, and further remarks in his exordium that he feels himself irresistably impelled to do whatever is in his power "*to dissuade the public from continuing to agitate a subject fraught with the most direful consequences.*" I too, emulous of his high example, am desirous of making a "*calm, dispassionate and argumentative appeal to the good sense of the whole community,*" but how this can be done without agitating the subject, and in the way of dissuading the public from such agitation, the learned senator has not taught me. If the appeal he has made to the good sense of the public be calm, dispassionate and argumentative, as it purports to be, in what mode is that good sense to profit by the appeal without agitating the subject? This criticism, I am sorry to say, does not arise from a mere *lapsus linguæ* of the orator, but reaches the foundation of the statesman's principles. The text book which he chose for the purpose of giving an exposition of those principles, was a petition praying that counter petitions should not be acted upon nor agitated, and the commentator has done justice to his text, and I doubt not to himself. The great drift of his speech is an argument to desist from arguing, an appeal to common sense, beseeching her to renounce her functions, a petition to reason to abdicate her throne. Philanthropy is also implored to suppress her sympathies, and our country women are besought to reflect that "*the ink which they shed in subscribing with their fair hands abolition petitions, may prove the pre-*

lude to the shedding of the blood of their brethren." If this be sound doctrine, it has been reserved for the boasted wisdom of the nineteenth century, and for the genius of our free institutions to develop it, and to disclose to an astonished world, that there is a principle in the human mind, instinct with sympathy for the oppressed, which feeds upon elementary truth, whose armor is free discussion; that this principle threatens subversion to our republican institutions; that in order to avert national calamity, chains must be forged in silence for its restraint, and that the links of those chains constitute the bonds of our union; that there is a highway to national prosperity, but the lamp of truth must not shine upon it, and the righteousness of which it is treason to question.

NO. II.

MR. EDITOR,—In the opening number of this review I followed Mr. Clay through his preparatory remarks, in which he sets forth the purpose and design of his speech, and after pointing out some of the inconsistencies involved in it, left him. On resuming my task I propose to adopt the same order in the arrangement of topics detailed and discussed, which he has done, believing it to be not only the most natural and simple mode, but the most fair and impartial to both the author and his subject.—This course leads me here to introduce his description of the three classes of persons into which he divides those who are opposed, or apparently opposed "to the *continued* existence of Slavery in the United States."

"The first," says he, "are those who from sentiments of philanthropy and humanity are conscientiously opposed to the existence of slavery, but who are no less opposed at the same time, to any disturbance of the peace and tranquility of the Union, or the infringement of the powers of the states composing the confederacy. In all this class may be comprehended the peaceful, exemplary society of 'Friends,' one of whose established maxims is an abhorrence of war in all its forms, and the cultivation of peace and good will among all mankind. The next class consists of the apparent abolitionists—that is, those who having been persuaded that the right of petition has been violated by congress, co-operate with the abolitionists for the sole purpose of asserting that right. And the third class are the real ultra abolitionists, who are resolved to persevere in the pursuit of their object at all hazards and without regard to any consequences, however calamitous they may be. With them the rights of property are nothing; the deficiency of the powers of the general government is nothing; the acknowledged and incontestible powers of the states are nothing; civil war, a dissolution of the Union, and the overthrow of a government in which are concentrated the fondest hopes of the civilized world are

nothing. A single idea has taken possession of their minds, and onward they pursue it, overlooking all barriers, reckless and regardless of all consequences. With this class, the immediate abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia and in the Territory of Florida, the prohibition of the removal of slaves from state to state, and the refusal to admit any new state comprising within its limits the institution of domestic slavery, are but so many means conducing to the ultimate but perilous end at which they avowedly and boldly aim, and but so many short stages in the long and bloody road to the distant goal to which they would finally arrive. Their purpose is abolition, universal abolition, peaceably if it can, forcibly if it must. Their object is no longer concealed by the thinnest veil." He further states that if other means should be found insufficient, that they will "invoke finally the more potent powers of the bayonet."

These are certainly grave charges, and if true, (considering the rapidly increasing numerical strength of this class of abolitionists) fully justify this professedly vigilant sentinel of constitutional liberty, in sounding the alarm from the watch-tower of her citadel. They are made too, by a man who must have as full and intimate knowledge of the doctrines and measures of the abolitionists as any man in America; for it must be borne in mind that Mr. Clay is President of the Colonization Society of the United States, and has, ever since its organization in 1816, been one of its most zealous and influential members. That the colonizationists, for reasons which it is foreign to my purpose to examine any farther than they are disclosed in this speech by their presiding officer, have waged an unremitting and deadly hostility against the American Anti-Slavery Society, from its birth. It is therefore morally impossible that Mr. Clay, the adroit and puissant champion as he has uniformly proved himself to be in this struggle, should be ignorant of the character and operations of the Anti-Slavery Society. However successful he and his coadjutors may have been in deceiving a much abused public on this point, they could not have been deceived themselves. Justice to both Mr. Clay and the abolitionists, requires a careful and impartial examination of the truth of these charges, for by a rule of moral retribution, which no man understands better than himself, next, and *only* next to the detestation due this society if the charges are true, must be the public odium and infamy earned by Mr. Clay if they are shown to be false and gratuitous.

On the 6th day of December, 1833, at the city of Philadelphia, the American Anti-Slavery Society commenced its organized existence by the delegates there assembled, adopting and signing the following preamble and articles of association.

"WHEREAS the Most High God 'hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth,' and hath commanded them to love their neighbors as themselves; and whereas our national.

existence is based upon this principle, as recognized in the Declaration of Independence, 'that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;' and whereas, after the lapse of nearly sixty years since the faith and honor of the American people were pledged to this avowal, before Almighty God, and the world, nearly one-sixth part of the nation are held in bondage by their fellow-citizens; and whereas slavery is contrary to the principles of natural justice, of our republican form of government, and of the Christian religion, and is destructive to the prosperity of the country, while it is endangering the peace, union and liberties of the States; and whereas we believe it the duty and interest of the masters, immediately to emancipate their slaves, and that no scheme of expatriation, either voluntary or by compulsion, can remove this great and increasing evil; and whereas we believe that it is practicable, by appeals to the consciences, hearts and interests of the people, to awaken a public sentiment throughout the nation, that will be opposed to the continuance of slavery, prevent a general convulsion; and whereas we believe we owe it to the oppressed, to our fellow-citizens who hold slaves, to the whole country, to posterity, and to God, to do all that is lawfully in our power to bring about the extinction of slavery. we do hereby agree with a prayerful reliance on Divine aid, to form ourselves into a society, to be governed by the following

CONSTITUTION.

ART. 1. This Society shall be called the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

ART. 2. The object of this Society is the entire abolition of slavery in the United States. While it admits that each state, in which slavery exists, has, by the constitution of the United States, the exclusive right to legislate in regard to its abolition in said State, it shall aim to convince all our fellow-citizens by arguments addressed to their understandings and consciences, that slave-holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety and best interests of all concerned require its immediate abandonment, without expatriation. The Society will also endeavor in a constitutional way, to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade, and to abolish slavery in those portions of our common country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia,—and likewise to prevent the extension of it to any state that may be hereafter admitted to the Union.

ART. 3. This Society shall aim to elevate the character and condition of the people of color, by encouraging their intellectual, moral, and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice, that thus they may, according to their intellectual and moral worth, share an equality with the whites, of civil and religious privileges; but this Society will never, in any way countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force.

ART. 4. Any person who consents to the principles of this Constitution who contributes to the funds of this Society, and is not a

slaveholder, may be a member of this Society, and shall be entitled to a vote at the meetings.

The above is all that relates to the principles of this society, the remaining articles merely regulating its organization. Under this constitution the abolitionists have now been acting upwards of five years. During that period they have been charged with various unconstitutional and incendiary measures and designs, particularly that of sending to the slaves, papers and prints tending to excite them to insurrection. These charges have been as often repelled by the society, not only by showing that such conduct would amount to a violation of their vows, solemnly plighted in their constitution, but by a full and absolute denial of the truth of the charges, accompanied with a challenge to the world to establish them by proof in a single instance. No such proof has been adduced, nor a single case shown of insurrectionary action among the slaves growing out of the movements of this society. I shall therefore assume for the present, till called on for further proof, (abundance of which is at hand,) that this association, like every other which professes to be governed by conscientious motives, does not profess one thing and practice another, but that its constitution is a legitimate index of its principles, its motives, and as far as declared, its measures and mode of action.

I have, therefore, Mr. Editor, spread at length this document before your readers, believing that most of those who join in the popular outcry and fashionable sneer against abolitionism, have never read it. I believe also, that the great mass of those who have assailed the despised abolitionists with blind rage and wrathful denunciation, (and these are the only weapons employed to put them down) have been more sinned against than sinning, for they knew not what they did. To those over whom this mantle of charity does not extend, the invitation is kindly and fearlessly tendered to scan this document closely, critically and severely, and point out in it if they can any principle or mode of action which is not built on the rock of natural and revealed truth, or which is inconsistent with the soundest doctrines of constitutional law, or the purest democratic principles. I would also ask those who consider this task too laborious for them, to lay this instrument side by side with Mr. Clay's beautiful and justly merited eulogium on the Society of Friends, and point out, if they can, the slightest discrepancy between the spirit of that "bloody and incendiary" document and their peaceful and benignant principles. I have only room to add that if any discrepancy is discovered, it has escaped the vigilance of the "Friends" themselves, for the most prominent and zealous leaders in the abolition ranks, are these same non-resisting Quakers. Jefferson's maxim was, "resistance to tyrants is obedience to

God"—but the abolitionist has learned of the Quaker to construe the Divine precept of the Prince of Peace, "*resist not evil*," in its simplest sense, and enjoins on the poor crushed slave, non-resistance to his oppressor.

NO. III.

MR. EDITOR,—In the last number of this review, I laid before your readers the constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society, exhibiting its character and designs in contrast with Mr. Clay's description of it, for the purpose of exhibiting in one comprehensive view, the glaring perversions and flagrant calumny with which he stands convicted. These documents occupied so much space that little room was left for suitable comment and explanation. I propose therefore in this and one or two subsequent numbers to examine briefly in detail, such features of the anti-slavery constitution as are more severely denounced by Mr. Clay in the course of his speech, and are often reprehended by many, who unlike him, are honestly opposed to slavery in the abstract, but do not concur with the abolitionists in the means proper for its eradication. Among those features probably the most obnoxious, is their doctrine of the *immediate*, as contra-distinguished from the *gradual* emancipation of the slave. This doctrine is viewed by Mr. Clay, and I doubt not, by many who are more conscientious though less conversant with the subject, as an *ultra-ism* of an alarming type, and has given birth to much honest indignation, as well as designed injustice to the abolitionists. I cannot, therefore, I conceive, better employ my pen in advancing the cause of justice between Mr. Clay and the victim of his unhallowed persecution, than by devoting the present number to an examination of this tenet of the anti-slavery creed.

If in the advancement of legislative science a course of policy or system of laws should be found inexpedient, or less expedient than a new or improved system, the old system ought to be abolished or superseded by the new. But the institutions of the country built on the old system, may be so affected by the change that the evils incident to the transition state, though temporary, may go far towards counterbalancing the permanent advantages expected from the change. In such a case the obvious wisdom and true policy of legislation is exhibited in passing from one system to the other so gradually as to occasion the least possible present derangement consistent with the attainment of the ultimate permanent good. This rule of legislative expediency is very well illustrated by our tariff laws. It was formerly considered a good system of national policy to employ the constitutional power of Congress over imposts, as an in-

strument to foster and protect domestic manufactures, but this policy is now being abandoned and superseded by that of imposing an *ad valorem* duty merely as a substitute for direct taxation, and to an amount barely sufficient to defray the ordinary expenses of government. But as the sudden reduction of duties incident to an immediate change of measures would operate disastrously to our many large and important manufacturing interests, the true rule of correct legislation is found in a graduated tariff, requiring a lapse of many years to complete the change.— But supposing a statute or system of laws is not merely inexpedient but unconstitutional, a very different mode of remedying the evil is required. Such a statute is in fact no law, and must be so pronounced whenever its validity comes in question. It can only be upheld by brute force, or some other power equally revolutionary in its operation and treasonable in its tendencies. But if we look beyond human compacts and all other derived power, and find that a system or code of laws is framed in violation of the primitive and underived source of power as disclosed by the light of nature or the volume of received inspiration, there cannot, in the nature of things, exist any necessity that would justify the continuation of such laws for a single day. God commands their immediate nullification, and we must obey God rather than man. To deliberate on the policy or expediency of continuing to uphold them, is to hold a council of war against Omnipotence.

The application of this doctrine of *immediateism* to the abolition of slavery, raises the question, whether American slavery, defined and regulated by its own code of laws, and as it exists in its legitimate and unabused practice under that code, is intrinsically sinful or not. Although the Anti-Slavery Society, in its constitution assumes, without reference to this question, that immediate abolition would be expedient as a matter of policy to all parties interested in the slavery code, yet as this rule of expediency is, as above shown, extremely flexible in its nature, I prefer not to seek its aid, but to rely on the simpler and uncompromising rule which the solution of this question may evolve.

In casting about for premises or foundation truth on which to build an argument to prove the sinfulness of slavery, the mind is baffled in its search to find any thing that is more clear, simple and elementary in its nature, than the proposition sought to be proved.—That “all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” is a proposition ranked among self-evident truths in the declaration of our national independence, and among the many improvements and refinements which ethical science has under-gone since that day, no analysis has been made of this truth into those which are more primary or elementary.

The doctrine of human rights and obligations, of moral justice, of the various duties of man to man, resulting from the fraternal relation of a common nature, common infirmity, and common suffering, are all elementary principles, which are not only understood and recognized at the dawn of our existence as moral agents, but are necessarily put into daily and hourly practice during the whole period of our probationary existence. They may be classed among the instincts of immortal mind, and are often exhibited as perfectly in the school boy's debating club, as in the councils of sages or the assembly of divines. If the human soul in ascending from its fraternal to its filial relation, contemplates itself as a creature of God impressed with his moral image, another class of truths, equally elementary, spring up. The human mind, however rudely developed, however degraded by sin or darkened by ignorance, is still a germ of immortality, and evinces those high born and indestructible attributes which demonstrate its Divine paternity. No matter in what zone of his footstool the God of nature may have cast his nativity, or breathed the immortal principle into his quickening body, no matter how fiercely that body may have been burnt upon by a torrid sun, he is still the CHILD OF GOD, and as such has high duties to discharge, interests of infinite magnitude to advance, and a glorious destiny to fulfil. Although God's *creature*, he is too dignified, too God like to be his *slave*. God negotiates with him as a free moral agent, in the full and unrestrained exercise of his own volition. He reasons with him to convince his understanding that the only accessible way to happiness is in the path of obedience, but leaves him free to obey or to disobey, at his option. In view of this relation, it must be obvious that man, however degraded and abject, stands immeasurably and infinitely higher in point of rank than a beast, or a tree, or any other object over which the Creator has given him dominion. Even the noblest creature of the material universe, the sun himself, in diffusing light and heat over a dependent and otherwise benighted and dreary assemblage of surrounding worlds, is but a means, of vast beneficence, indeed, but still a means, a mere subservient to other creatures, whose glory is summed up in mere utility; but man is a great, an infinite end in himself, and any measures tending to transmute him from an end into a means, to restrain, hamper or impede the free and Godlike attributes of his nature in his high career of action, is not only doing him an immense wrong, but is a personal insult to his great Prototype.

But slavery supposes one man to be absolutely and entirely under the control and dominion of another. The master's will is the slave's supreme and only rule of action, however repugnant it may be to his own, or that of his God. If the master relaxes this rule, it is considered yielding a right, and is to be esteemed a

favor not to be claimed of the master's justice but to be besought of his mercy. Such are the principles on which the American Slave Code is built. "A slave" (says the Louisiana Code) "is one who is in the power of his master to whom he belongs; the master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry and his labor; he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything but what belongs to his master; they are to be considered real estate, and as such may be mortgaged, and levied upon and sold." "Slaves" (says the South Carolina Statute) "shall be deemed, sold, taken and reputed to be chattels personal, in the hands of their owners and possessors, their executors, administrators and assigns, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatever."

In order to keep his body in subjection it is necessary that his mind should be *put out*, as far as practicable; hence "mental instruction" is forbidden him under severe penalties and it is made penal to teach him how to "*search the scriptures*." The marriage rite is prohibited or nullified and the command of God enjoining the relative duties of husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister are supplanted by the slave code, and the pure fountain of happiness and joy which God has ordained to spring from the faithful discharge of those duties is denied him.

It is a painful, and I trust, an unnecessary task for me even to enumerate all the slave's bereavements, and I gladly resign it in the perfect conviction that I have hinted at enough of them to convince every unprejudiced mind, that the name of slavery is **LEGION** among moral evils—that if the slaveholders were a nation of Howards, they could not righteously employ such powers as a means to effect any end, however noble and philanthropic.

But a new battery has been opened on this doctrine of the abolitionists with a brief notice of which I must close these remarks. It was till lately conceded by all parties that slavery was a moral evil, and would be a great sin, but for the greater evil in the carnage, massacre and murders consequent upon emancipation.—

But the great and triumphant experiment of immediate abolition as practised in the West Indies, has stripped the slaveholder of every shadow of excuse, and has taught him what he ought to have taken on trust, that *the path of duty is always the path of safety*. Driven from this refuge, he and his apologist are forced upon a vindication of the righteousness of slavery, and have appealed to the volume of Revelation to sustain its unhallowed code. This is not the first time that the holy oracles of revealed truth have been invoked to sanctify exploded error and convicted iniquity, but I may boldly assert that it is the first time the appeal has been made without the shadow of authority and in defiance of the received axioms of moral truth. It is not my design in this place to open the sacred volume and canvass the few isolated

texts relied on to vindicate an institution, compounded as slavery is, of heinous sins which are denounced on its every page.—I will content myself here to ask, in christian meekness and becoming docility of spirit, those consecrated teachers in Israel who expound the word of God in vindication of slavery, what attitude they propose to assume, when contending with the infidel for the truth of divine revelation? Christianity has been ably attacked with every weapon that human ingenuity could invent or human depravity forge, but she has again, with the sword of truth, signally and triumphantly routed and discomfited her enemies, and driven them scattered and dismayed from the field. The last weapon that was raised against her was the profane sneer and obscene ribaldry of Paine and his feeble brood of proselytes; but could that infidel have discovered that American slavery was consistent with christianity, with what force could he have employed those philosophical truths, so ably expounded by him in his *Rights of man*, to bear against the bulwarks of the christian's faith? If those truths which I have here vainly attempted to elucidate in consequence of their being self-evident, are not in accordance with the bible, then it is equally self-evident that the God of Nature cannot be the God of Revelation.—The infidel instead of appealing to the base and grovelling passions of our nature, will build his fortress on the rock of invincible truth, as received and acknowledged by common consent, and will hurl his shafts with omnipotent power against the hitherto impregnable battlements of the cross. Instead of worshipping at the shrine of brutal voluptuousness he will erect a temple to the God of nature, and dedicate it as a sanctuary to the oppressed victim of a religion which professes *good will to men*, but which sanctions his being *chattelized* by his fellow men. In this temple the slave-holders oblation will be an abominable thing, and he will be told by the priest of the sanctuary, in the language of him who is represented to have spoken as never man spake "Leave thy gift before the altar and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother and then come and offer thy gift."

NO. IV.

Having in the last number shown that American Slavery was intrinsically a sin or a transgression of the moral law, I propose in this to inquire upon whom and to what extent the responsibility of it rests. The leading object of Mr. Clay's speech is to convince us, citizens of the free states, that American slavery is no concern of ours. "Utterly destitute" (says he) "of constitutional or other rightful power, living in totally distinct communities, as alien to the communities in which the subject on which

they would operate resides, so far as concerns political power over that subject, as if they lived in Africa or Asia, they (the abolitionists) promulgate to the world their purpose to be to manumit forthwith and without compensation and without moral preparation, three millions of negro slaves under jurisdictions altogether separated from those under which they live." "The slavery which exists among us is our affair, not theirs, and they have no more just concern with it than they have with slavery as it exists throughout the world." These and kindred positions are assumed in every variety of form, and amplified and illustrated with the orator's usual powers of eloquence, and (as I shall presently show) more than his usual laxity of principle and contempt of truth. Mr. Clay labors to confound and jumble together the two classes of duties and responsibilities which the abolitionists conceive devolve on them, but which in their constitution and the nature of things are entirely and obviously distinct and unconnected. One of these, and probably the one of lesser magnitude, arises from their being citizens of this republican government on whom, as such, the responsibility of the law making power, so far as their influence is concerned, devolves, in which capacity they, in their constitution, define and limit the extent of this duty by stating that they "will endeavor in a constitutional way to influence Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade and to abolish slavery in those parts of our country which come under its control, especially in the District of Columbia, and to prevent the extension of it to any state that may be hereafter admitted to the Union," and to prevent misapprehension they at the same time admit in this article of their constitution "that *each state* in which slavery exists, has by the constitution of the United States, the *exclusive right to legislate in regard to its abolition in said state.*" While contending that Congress can and ought to exercise those constitutional powers above enumerated, the abolitionists concede that Congress has no more power or right to repeal the slave codes of the different states, than they would to repeal the act of the British parliament abolishing slavery in the West Indies. The powers which the abolitionists contend that Congress can lawfully exercise, have never been seriously disputed by any one. Even Mr. Clay, in this speech, does not hazard his reputation as a constitutional lawyer so far as frankly and openly to give a denial of the correctness of their doctrines. He, and all the other opponents to anti-slavery action in Congress, have not, that I am aware of, gone further than contend that Congress, by abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia, would commit an act of ill faith towards Virginia and Maryland, by whom the District was ceded to the federal government, and that such act would amount to a fraud on the spirit and intent of the compact under which the

cession was made. To the many answers made to this objection, I propose to add one which I do not remember to have seen used by the abolitionists. Among the enumerated powers conferred by the constitution on Congress, is that "to exercise *exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever* over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may by cession of particular states and the acceptance of Congress become the seat of government of the United States." This it must be remembered is an extract from the primitive, organic and supreme law of the land, and that consequently, any national treaty, act of Congress, state constitution, legislative act, or other human compact or convention whatever, which impinges on the full and absolute supremacy and sovereign authority of this law must fall to the ground as a mere nullity. If, therefore, as is contended, there was an implied faith, mutual understanding, pledge of honor, mental reservation, or other design, uttered or unuttered, in the minds of the legislatures of Virginia and Maryland on the one part, or of the federal authorities who accepted the cession on the other, that Congress should not exercise its uncontrolled and absolute dominion over this spot of ground, such design or pledge so far as it was intended to influence posterity, can be viewed in no better light than a conspiracy to pervert the organized functions of government, and instead of being respected, should be condemned as a treasonable plot, by every friend to constitutional law and order.

This brings me to notice one of the many and shifting positions which Mr. Clay has at length taken in relation to this question, which meets my entire concurrence. He says that congress in legislating for the district has two duties to discharge; the first is to render it available and convenient as the seat of the federal government, and the other (which is totally distinct) is to legislate for the benefit and with reference to the interests and wishes of the inhabitants of the district. He then has the hardihood to ask "is it necessary in order to render this place a *comfortable* seat of the general government to abolish slavery within its limits? . No one (he adds) will advance such a proposition." In this he is mistaken, for I am one who will not only advance it, but in behalf of deeply insulted liberty, will answer his interrogatory by asking that brazen reprobate from her temple, if it is a "*comfortable*" thing for congress, in the plenitude of its power over the subject, to sustain in its midst an institution abhorred by God and man, and bid the iron of slavery enter into seven thousand human souls? Is it "*comfortable*" for the American patriot, philanthropist or christian, to see exhibited to the derision of the haughty representatives of European despotism, that *last hope of liberty*, the STAR SPANGLED BANNER, floating in its own appropriate citadel, over its enchained and imbruted fellow

men? Does it glad the patriot's eye to see, as I have lately seen, the American eagle described with sarcastic bitterness, in a British periodical, as bearing aloft in his talons the lacerated and gasping body of a kidnapped child of Africa? Is it "comfortable" to see thus desecrated, this little green spot of ground, this *sanctum sanctorum* of LIBERTY, towards which her votaries throughout the wide world open the windows of their chambers that they may look hitherward, when, like Daniel, in defiance of the iron law of despotism, they bend in devotion three times a day?

I am next led to notice Mr. Clay's labors and waste of strength to prove that the power given to congress "to *regulate* commerce with foreign nations and among the several states," is, as he terms it, *conservative* and not *destructive*, and consequently does not authorize a *prohibition* of the inter-state slave trade. To this objection I will only remark that congress in the exercise of this power as regards foreign nations "*regulated*" commerce so as to bring it within the laws of God, by declaring the African slave trade to be PIRACY, and by the same constitutional, and as I conceive by the same moral rule, they can and ought so to regulate the inter-state slave trade. If Mr. Clay's scruples of conscience about the constitutional meaning of the word "regulate" are not relieved by this remark, I add for his benefit another mode of construing this word. Let the domestic slave trade be so "regulated," that no human being shall be transported out of his native state, without his free and voluntary consent, given on a careful examination, before a court or some judicial officer.

If these views are correct, the question is very properly addressed to every *citizen* who believes slavery to be sinful, how he is to be relieved from the weight of that sin, unless he uses his constitutional power in favor of congressional action in these several modes in which congress has jurisdiction of the subject? But this, as I remarked before, is a comparatively limited and restricted, though I believe a legitimate and unexceptionable mode of anti-slavery action.

The great field of duty is moral influence, not as *citizens*, but as *accountable human beings*, on this and all other sins that exist in our country, or in the world, whether sanctioned or unsanctioned by civil government. The enquiry how far we are responsible for the various moral evils with which the world is overspread, in what capacity and to what extent, and in what mode we can discharge that responsibility and stand acquitted of those evils, is a curious and interesting branch of ethical science, which has not received that attention its great practical importance and utility would warrant. However interesting a task it would be for me to examine fully these questions in all their

hearings, I cannot without manifest digression, do more in this place than refer to a few general and elementary principles, which I do not propose to spend time in illustrating, believing that they will not be seriously controverted.

The chief end of a virtuous life and the polar star of duty, is to bend our energies to the relief, removal and prevention of human misery; and every good and wise man will carefully husband his pecuniary, his physical, his intellectual and his moral resources, his station and his character in society as so much aggregate capital confided to him for the purpose of expenditure in doing good. In this pursuit it is a solecism to suppose that too much zeal can be employed. But the fundamental error into which many good but misguided minds fall, and which is the basis and source of all ultraism and fanaticism together, with the numerous spawn of affiliated evils which follow in their train, consists in the employment of improper and unwarrantable means to attain the desired end. As shown in my last number, every man is a responsible moral agent, and any infraction of his rights as such, throws him out of his legitimate sphere, breaks the harmony of the moral law, and does him an unspeakable wrong. No matter how benevolent our designs may be towards him, we have no right to arrogate the power of coercing him to what we may think is for his good. This doctrine I then applied to the usurped authority of the master over his slave, and it has an equal though less palpable application in our course of conduct towards what we consider the sins of the slaveholder. I am free to concede that so far as his sins are concerned in the slavery question, we have done our duty when we have laid before him firmly and frankly what we believe to be the truth, and have in kind and friendly remonstrance addressed to his understanding and heart, such arguments as have convinced our understandings and hearts of the sinfulness of slavery. Here our duty to him ends, and whether we are heeded or unheeded by him, we are no longer responsible for his sins. Thus far, if I remember right, I am sanctioned by the authority of the Rev. President Wayland, in his very ingenious and partly sound and partly sophistical treatise on the doctrine of human responsibility. But there are other duties than those which we owe to the slaveholder, which with mingled surprise and regret, I find that he has passed over in silence. On taking leave of the hospitable slaveholder, the victim of his oppression must not be forgotten in the circle of our relative duties. Although he is a *thing*, a mere *chattel* in the eyes of his master, yet in our estimation he is our "*neighbor*," whom we are enjoined to love as ourselves; and who, though dumb, can make a more eloquent and moving appeal to that love than did he in his *calamity* who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho to the sym-

pathies of the Samaritan. However striking the analogy, I cannot in charity suppose that the reverend President did, like his sacerdotal brethren of the elder dispensation, designedly "*pass by on the other side*" of so bereaved a "*neighbor*." I am left, however, to pursue this branch of my enquiry unaided by the guidance of his learned but *peculiarized* pen.

We are bound by the terms of the compact with the slaveholder to lend him our physical arm when needed to aid in preventing the slave from rising and seeking to gain his rights by violence. While we redeem as we ought, this pledge in its letter and its spirit, does it not place us in a relation to the slave which renders it peculiarly proper and befitting that we should stand forth his firm and zealous advocate in appealing from his oppressor's sense of justice to the moral influence and opinion of the world? This is indeed a vague tribunal, but it has legitimate and universal jurisdiction. It is, too, the only earthly court which lends an ear to the slave's complaint, or recognizes him as a suiter on its records, and even here he has no means of being heard in person. Bereft of every other mode of redress, and having moral rights for which he has no other remedy, does not the duty rest with additional weight on the conscience of every friend of justice and humanity throughout the wide world to bear firm, faithful and righteous testimony in his behalf? And does it not rest on us, who are connected with him in an endless variety of political relations, (although by none are we enabled to afford him direct relief,) to act as his *next friend* in carrying on this appeal? In so great and humane a cause, I know of no means within the scope of impartial and exact truth, which we may not freely and zealously employ. In conducting this appeal we must be equally fearful of doing injustice to the oppressor and the oppressed, and the sin of slavery must lie on our consciences, if, in compliance with Mr. Clay's appeal to us as fellow citizens, we suppress and smother truth. The "*peculiar institutions of the South*" must set up no *peculiar* claims to exemption from such a trial. Let justice be done, though it force the slaveholder to relinquish either his victim or his character. To the full benefit of such an alternative, the slave has a righteous claim, for it is his only earthly hope; nor can I for a moment doubt that whatever course Mr. Clay and a few callous hearted and ruthless politicians of his school may take when brought to this alternative, that the great body of the truly high minded and chivalrous sons of the south will unhesitatingly and instinctively surrender their early and peculiar predilections to an enlightened and virtuous PUBLIC OPINION, by repealing their slave codes and letting the oppressed go free.

NO. V.

In my last two numbers I was employed in establishing the doctrine that slavery was a great moral evil, a sin of enormous magnitude against human nature—that the responsibility of its continuance rested on our consciences, to a certain extent, directly as citizens of the free states, in our political capacity and to a still greater extent as members of the human family, entertaining as we ought, a lively and deeply sympathetic interest in whatever affects any portion of that family, or encroaches on the attributes of man. If I had succeeded as I think I must have done, in establishing these positions to the satisfaction of every careful and candid examiner, it might naturally be expected that I would have brought my remarks to a close, believing that I had attained my proposed end—that I ought to have relied on the moral and political truisms, that righteousness, justice and duty are infallible standards of expediency, or according to the favorite and ruling maxim of the father of his country, "*honesty is the best policy*." But, strange as it may seem to an unsophisticated mind, if I had stopped here my task would have been done but by halves, and the wretched victim of our oppression would be still left writhing in his chains. There is on this subject a modern jesuitism, which surpasses in subtlety, as much as it falls short in speciousness, that which moulded the consciences of our monastic ancestors of the 16th century. In the boasted march of mind it has outstripped our moral and intellectual philosophy. It has attained the professor's chair and is clinging for no feeble support to the American pulpit. Among the maxims coined for practical currency in its mint, some to advance the designs of the crafty politician, and some to soothe the conscience of the unreflecting christian, may be reckoned the following—all is fair in politics—in order to avoid a union of church and state, the good man must, when going to the ballot box, leave his conscience behind him—what is *individually wrong* may be *nationally right*—a moral and democratic body of legislators, representing a moral and democratic constituency, can establish and uphold the most immoral and abominable despotism and oppression the sun ever shone on—the "*peculiar institution*," compounded as it is of moral and political enormities, must not be assailed *politically* because it is a *moral* evil, and by the same logic reciprocated from the pulpit, it must not be denounced *there* because it is a *political* evil—unrighteousness, when borne into high places by the misguided opinion of a christian nation, and hedged in and built up on human statutes, (the legitimate impress of that opinion under our democratic institutions,) is changed in its nature and name, and it must no

longer be denounced from the pulpit, but it is to be revered as "an ordinance of God," "a mysterious dispensation of Providence"—iniquity, as it grows hoary with years, emits a self-sanctifying exudation, or, as Mr. Clay more *piously* expresses it, "*that is property which the law declares to be property, and two hundred years of legislation have SANCTIONED and SANC-TIFIED negro slaves to be property.*" We must choose the least of two moral evils, and in applying the modern conscience-gauger, to settle the question of *differential* turpitude, we must follow this GREAT COMPROMISER to the *national* slave market, and ascertain the *minimum* and *maximum* price current of a human soul at the *federal* shambles. After making due allowance for tare and tret, old age and decrepitude, he averages the nett value of one-fifth of all that portion of our race, whose flesh and bones are made like our own, of republican earth, at \$400 a head, and multiplying these \$400 by 3,000,000 of souls, gives, according to his arithmetic, a product in dollars of 1200,000,000 *federal* currency. This aggregate capital is a tangible and ponderous good, and when placed in the *avoirdupois* balance of his conscience, outweighs liberty, justice, humanity, honesty, philanthropy, and all such like impalpable and therefore impracticable "*abstractions.*"

In order, therefore, to befriend the slave, it is necessary that I should descend from the highway of principle, although so plain that the wayfaring man, although a fool, (unless such an one as hath said in his heart there is no God,) need not err therein. It is necessary to lend a patient ear to the objections stated, and obstacles direct and collateral, conjured up against anti-slavery action, which our *expediency* statesman has, like an adroit field marshal, arrayed in the form of a phalanx against us—at the apex of which stands in severe and awful majesty, "DANGER OF DISSOLVING THE UNION." I propose, therefore, to inquire into the validity and merits of this objection, which not only Mr. Clay, but many with more sincerity, though less research than he, are vehemently urging against the abolitionists.

The distinctive principles of constitutional democracy, as illustrated by their great expounder, Thomas Jefferson, and as now (professedly at least,) conceded by all political parties, are, that the states are independent and distinct sovereign powers, in each of whom is inherent all political power not expressly and unequivocally granted to the federal government for the common weal. That the federal constitution is in fact but a compact or treaty of alliance and confederation voluntarily entered into by sovereign and otherwise independent states, for certain purposes therein specified, and for no other purposes, that this compact like every other is binding and obligatory on all the parties to it, to the extent that it purports to bind them respectively, but no

farther; that nothing is to be taken by implication, but each state, after yielding full and entire compliance with its constitutional obligations thus construed, has kept its faith and honor unbroken with the sister republics, and it is at perfect liberty to mould its own peculiar institutions according to its own sovereign will and pleasure. The constitution indeed guaranties to every state in the Union a republican form of government, but beyond this, they, *as states*, have no control over each other's peculiar institutions. In meeting our sister republics in congressional deliberation, I would carry into that body a generous and conciliatory spirit. On mere questions of local policy and pecuniary interest, I would even purchase friendship by carrying out that wise and benignant precept which enjoins us rather to *suffer wrong than do wrong*. I would do so, however, not for the sake of *preserving* the Union, but of *strengthening* it. But when the great principle of the RIGHTS OF MAN are involved, when the question whether human slavery is to be engrafted on federal soil is at issue, or whether the domestic slave trade is to be tolerated by congress, I would lay judgment to the line and righteousness to the plummet. I would look into the constitution, and while I scrupulously and punctiliously kept faith with the South, as plighted in that instrument, I would also see how far my arm was hampered by it, in striking a death blow, and cutting up by the roots this moral Upas, this national reproach. I would say to the slaveholder, keep your own peculiar institutions within your own appropriate territory, beyond the range of congressional action. for I have, in following the example of your own illustrious Jefferson, sworn upon the altar of my country's LIBERTY, eternal opposition to tyranny in all its forms, and although as taught by your venerated Jackson, we will, in acting with you under the federal compact, ask nothing that is not clearly right, we cannot, and on this subject ought not, to submit to any thing that is wrong.

Now, if we compare these simple and impartial rules of construing the constitution and the mutual rights and duties of the states to each other under it, with the course pursued by certain Southern politicians, it will be found that they have as crude and ill-defined a sense of constitutional law, as they have of their own state laws and slave codes. In governing their slaves, in restraining free discussion and the liberty of the press among their fellow citizens, and in opposing congressional action on the slavery question, they employ but one weapon—INTIMIDATION.— This they wield in the shape of a *cat o' nine tails* with the first, lynching and mobbing the second, and a threat to commit perfidy and dishonor by breaking the bonds of the Union with the last. All are used with great bluster and terror-inspiring menace, and success is as confidently expected, and, as I shall

presently show, as certainly attained, in the last case as in the first. In both, arguments are used, the cogency of which none but a slaveholder can exhibit, and none but a slave, (I had almost said) can appreciate.

That I am not speaking at random, Mr. Editor, let me refer you to the several occasions in which the South has employed this threat to dissolve the Union. When Missouri sought admission into the sisterhood of republics with a slaveholding constitution in her hand, the South raised this war cry, and the North, in that species of compromise which freedom makes when colleaguering with slavery or virtue with vice, bent her suppliant knee to the Southern divinity, and received Missouri into the Union with slavery engraven on her forehead. It was in virtue of this threat that the Indians were driven out from the South, and that the tariff, adopted at their own suggestion, was modified to their wishes. Emboldened by such uniform success, this talismanic threat is now unblushingly employed to put down Northern freedom of speech and of the press, to crush moral influence in behalf of liberty, and in relieving the oppressed and humanizing the imbruted. The slaveholder's humble minion at the North, in more abject vassalage than his victim at the South, is so unconscious of the high-born and indomitable impulses which fire a freeman's bosom, that he thinks he can put down *moral*, with *brick bat* discussion. As the lion at the South roars, his jackal at the North yelps and snaps at the heels of the proscribed but undaunted votaries of TRUTH and LIBERTY.

Ohio has, indeed, in her darkest hour, bowed her spirit to the fell demon, and passed a law by which her freeborn and virtuous sons are to be fined and imprisoned, if, dictated by the purest sympathies of humanity, they spread their table to feed the poor persecuted victim, who, panting for freedom, and prompted by native untutored heroism, swims her noble river and flees, a hunted and stricken deer, through the "*buck eye*" state to regain his lost manhood under the British flag. But the deep damnation of that deed has aroused in her borders a spirit, to tyranny awful, as that which passed before the vision of Eliphaz the Temanite, and the ear of her MORRIS "hath received a little thereof." That truly DEMOCRATIC and high minded Senator, after standing forth boldly and alone in the national councils, and rebuking the demon of slavery which had just then given itself utterance through the chartered powers of Mr. Clay's eloquence; after bearding the lion in his own den, this noble statesman adds, "my belief in the truth of the doctrine of the declaration of independence, the political creed of Jefferson, remains unshaken and unsubdued. I hope in returning to my home and my friends, to join them again in rekindling the beacon fires of liberty upon every hill in our state, until the broad glare shall enlighten every

valley, and the song of triumph shall be heard to that holy Being who cannot look upon oppression but with abhorrence."

In my next number, I will examine whether the Union is in real danger or not from these threats, but I must close this by remarking, that if it can be preserved only by suppressing discussion and the liberty of the press, we must not substitute the means for the end. If besides fulfilling the compact on our part, the South wantonly breaks faith with us by refusing to fulfil on theirs, unless we also bow to their Moloch, then the Union, instead of being the *glory*, is the *reproach* of the age we live in. It is the union of *virtue* and her handmaid *liberty*, in the loathed and deadly embrace of slavery—it is such an union as Menzies effected when

"The living to the rotting dead
The God condemning Tuscan tied,
Till, by the way, or on his bed,
The poor corpse-carrier drooped and died;
Lashed hand to hand and face to face,
In fatal and in loathed embrace."

NO. VI.

In fulfilment of the promise made in my last number, I propose in this to enquire whether the slaveholding states will execute their oft repeated threat of dissolving the Union, unless we of the North cease from anti-slavery action in Congress. In deciding this question, we have too much reason to fear from past experience that they will be governed more by a sense of interest than a fear of violating faith with us, for it must be remembered that in their threats to secede, they have seldom urged any other pretext than self-interest. I do not wish, however, to be understood that in the mass of southern virtue and honor, there is not a sense of what is due to plighted public faith, that would go far towards preserving the Union at a liberal sacrifice of interest; but in the brief remarks I am going to make on this question, I am willing to leave out of view every motive excepting interest alone, by which they might be actuated.

The burthen of the slaveholders complaint now is, that the North talks about slavery, discusses its principles, and is beginning to follow, at a humble distance, the example of the whole christian world, in denouncing it as a great moral and political evil. The obvious effect of seceding for this cause, would be to increase that discussion, and thereby open the eyes of those who have heretofore seen its evils darkly. Anti-slavery discussion at the North, which is now under the bann of political and mercenary restraint, would become a popular hobby, and the demagogue who now fawns for the slaveholder's vote, would seek, and would find, popularity in *ultra* hatred of slavery.

The very act of dissolving the Union for this cause, and of forming a new confederation, as the slaveholding states would have to in order to preserve their beloved institution, would create such a discussion among themselves in their primary assemblies, their state conventions and congress of delegates, as would open the eyes of a majority of their own citizens to the newly discovered abominations of slavery. But aside from this, what power would this new slaveholding nation acquire to darken the understanding and paralyze the consciences of its citizens, which it does not now practise? The freedom of the press, on this subject, throughout the slave region, from Maryland to Florida, is already extinguished. In those cases where state laws do not extend far enough, lynch clubs and committees of vigilance step in, and visit with summary punishment those who have the temerity to speak above their breath the self-evident truths enumerated in the declaration of independence.

If the Union were dissolved, or the South were to secede from it, the mutual rights and duties of the slaveholding and the non-slaveholding states under the federal constitution would cease. The free states, instead of being as they now are, the hunting-grounds of fugitives from slavery, would become, in *fact*, what our 4th of July orators, by a *trope* more resembling *irony* than *metaphor*, represent as "THE ASYLUM OF THE OPPRESSED." A confederacy of slaveholding states would be a new thing under the sun. Slavery cannot stand alone, but must lean on freedom for physical strength to uphold it, and I doubt not but that long ere this, the South would have been involved in all the horrors of a servile war, if the slave had not been taught by his master that the fleets and armies of the nation, the militia of the north, were a standing army pledged to suppress his insurrectionary efforts. A nation isolated from freedom, in which the laboring class, the bone and muscle of the country, is enslaved, is marked out by the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, as a doomed and devoted land. To avoid the horrors of servile war, it must rely on a mercenary army to uphold its tottering institutions, and as a necessary result, the oppressor himself becomes the oppressed victim of a military despotism. For slavery, therefore, to threaten to secede from freedom, is like the clay threatening to separate from the lion, or the pauper to dissolve connection with his parish.

A word to Clio—she is cordially greeted by PHILALETHES as a coadjutor in "*moral suasion*," and in promoting free and temperate discussion. Philalethes is enamored of the *muses* much, but of TRUTH more. He loves, indeed, of a sportive hour to flirt with the Nine sisters among the springs and founts of Castalia, or the grotts and groves of Parnassus; but the magnet

of his heart never forgets to be drawn to the ruling star of his destiny with unerring polarity. The idol of his affections is, indeed, never more charming, than when beaming with that enthusiasm which is inspired by intermingling sentiments with the muses, but in yielding to the "*fine frenzy*," she must not be allured to renounce her own chaste and simple robe, for the gaudy drapery and meretricious trappings woven in the loom of an unbridled imagination. That she is in danger of being thus decoyed in yielding to the influence of CLIO, is not asserted nor insinuated; but it is insisted, that the HISTORIC MUSE has erred (for once at least,) in her facts relative to the alleged amelioration of the southern slave codes, and the growing tendency of public opinion at the south towards the abolition of slavery, before the commencement of northern action on that subject. These can and will be corrected when called for, another time; but with CLIO's opposition to political action to remedy a political evil, with her deductions from assumed facts and her ethical principles, so far as she has revealed herself, I am still more at variance. I would fain hope, however, that in this, as in most other cases of great apparent diversity of opinion, much conciliation may be effected by a frank and open avowal of our respective elementary principles. Contending for the sake of truth, and not for the sake of victory, I abhor a masked battery, and will, therefore, Mr. Editor, with *Philalethean* artlessness, lay before your readers, in answer to both CLIO and CLAY a leaf from the confession of faith, of that contemned, derided, deprecated and most *ultra* of all fanatics, a *political abolitionist*.

My democratic principles are a constituent and elementary part of my religion. Both spring out of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and consequently my politics are wedded in close and exclusive communion with all that sect of religionists who embrace that doctrine, whether they invoke the "Great First Cause" by the name of "Jehovah, Jove or Lord;" whether they worship Him in the Church, the Synagogue, the Mosque or the Pantheon. This doctrine, as heretofore shown, elevates man to an infinite height above the beasts that perish, and clothes him with functions and attributes essentially God-like; and, if not perverted, destined to grow more and more so, by expanding and increasing in strength throughout eternity. On this doctrine, the democratic principle that *man* is a co-ordinate being to *man*, is predicated. The powers of one soul, may indeed, transcend those of another, but it is only the difference of one star from another star in glory. Each is essentially co-equal, co-eternal with his fellow. This sublime doctrine was long the day dream of Pagan philosophy. It had its birth in the rude developements and lofty aspirations of the soul; in those yearnings, which the mind did not itself comprehend, after a higher

good than the eye or the ear could reveal to it, but which betrays an indestructible faith in its ultimate fruition beyond the grave. It was darkly revealed to the mind of Plato by this shadowy and evanescent evidence, but it was brought to light in all its grandeur in the volume of revelation. There the wondrous truth is unfolded that man is made in the image of God, a little lower than the angels, and is clothed with dominion over all sublunary things—that when by transgression he apostatized from his divine original, an infinite ransom was not deemed an over-equivalent to pay for his redemption. As shown in a former number, such a being cannot be chattelized, cannot be bereft of that *liberty* wherewith *Christ* hath made it free, without committing a crime of unspeakable enormity.

The noontide effulgence which beamed from the cross, dispelled, therefore, like the morning cloud and the early dew, the gigantic sin of slavery. Although deeply rooted in the Roman Empire, and firmly established on the throne of the Cæsars, its utter overthrow and abolition was the speedy achievement of a religion proclaiming *glad tidings*, and breathing *good will to men*. This was all that the primitive ambassadors of Christ taught, this is all that they ought to teach on this subject; but parallel to this doctrine, and springing from the same great *central truth* of the soul's immortality, it was reserved for Jefferson and his illustrious compeers, on the 4th of July, '76, to disclose and proclaim, as a fundamental principle in the philosophy of civil governments, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, *liberty* and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;" "and for the support of this declaration," said these primeval apostles of democracy, "with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor." This national vow stands recorded in Heaven, and constitutes the original compact entered into between the Supreme Ruler of the Universe and this nation, and which was fulfilled in a wonderful manner on his part by the deliverance vouchsafed us from monarchical thralldom and oppression; but more than threescore revolving years have witnessed our continued violation of a vow pledging us to support this heaven-approved democracy.

With the political abolitionist this is not a *dead* but a *living* faith, which he calls on all who profess, to make manifest by their works. The extent of the power of congress over slavery, as claimed by the abolitionists in their constitution, I have heretofore examined, and I believe it is not seriously controverted among statesmen and constitutional lawyers. Co-extensive

with this power, is the responsibility of its righteous exercise, and the length and breadth and depth of the *national sin* of slavery resting on our consciences, not as men but as citizens, not as moral agents, exercising a suasive influence, but as electors, wielding with our ballots, *sovereign power* and *legislative dominion* over it. Now let us for a moment refer to our statistics and see how this power has been heretofore and is now exercised.

Of the thirteen states which formed and adopted the constitution, six are still slaveholding states, viz: Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. These states, embracing an aggregate territory of 226,456 square miles, were from the beginning, sovereign, independent, slaveholding states, over whose peculiar institutions congress never had, or could exercise legislative control, and consequently is no more responsible for their slavery, (and probably less so,) than for slavery as it now exists in the island of Cuba. But since that time congress has admitted seven additional slaveholding states into the Union, viz: Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Arkansas, with an aggregate territory of 352,000 square miles. More than three-fifths, therefore, of all the slaveholding territory in the 26 states, have been made so by congressional enactment. Under what clause of the constitution, Congress derived this power, cannot be pointed out, unless it be in a furtherance of some one of the objects specified in the preamble, to which the old fashioned and ultra federalists are so prone to resort for constructive power, viz: "to form a more *perfect union*—establish *justice*—ensure *domestic tranquility*—provide for the *common defence*—promote the *general welfare*—or secure the blessings of *liberty* to ourselves and our posterity." I do not propose to discuss this constitutional question. What is done cannot now be undone. It is sufficient for my purpose to state, what no one disputes, that Congress had the constitutional power to abolish slavery in all these territories, while they were such, and to refuse their admission into the Union as slaveholding states. Such however is the promptitude with which Congress grants these irrevocable slaveholding licenses, that but two years ago, Arkansas was received into the Union with a constitution in her hand, *forbidding her own state legislature abolishing slavery in her dominions*. Florida, with a territory of 55,000 square miles, is about to obtain of Congress a license probably similar, if asked for, on her admission into the Union.

But this is not all. That most horrible and revolting of its features, the domestic slave trade, exists under the discretionary powers of Congress, uncontrolled by *any other* single power. I have no statistics to enable me to sound this evil, apparently

as deep as the bottomless pit, but could the federal marshal, who is soon to take the census of this nation, set down in one of his statistical columns, as the God of the oppressed does in his, the hearts broken, the wailings of despondency, the tearful and the tearless anguish, the uttered and the unutterable pangs, the raving and the mute despair which "points the parting anguish" when the family hearth is laid desolate, when the husband and wife, the parent and child are forcibly sundered to meet no more, by the northern slavemonger in making up his "cargoes of despair," assorted "to suit purchasers," as he is commissioned by the southern and western planter, it would swell into a mountain of sin, whose pinnacle would rend the clouds, and, if divided among the electors of this nation, who, by their united votes, commit it, each one would, I doubt not, be burthened with a share, equal, on an average, to all the other sins, disconnected with slavery, which he had ever committed. In making this estimate, I gauge the *quantum* of sin by the injury inflicted, without reference to the motive of its perpetrator. This is the human standard by which we all "share and share alike;" but natural as well as revealed religion, convinces me that the Searcher of hearts adopts a very different one—that the southern slaveholder, born and bred in the poisonous atmosphere of slavery, and imbibing its paralyzing opiates at every pore of his conscience, will be beaten with much "fewer stripes" than the northern abolitionist, who, convinced of its moral turpitude, goes at the appointed day to the ballot box, and deliberately, on full premeditation, casts his suffrage in support of the accursed traffic.

Political abolitionism is classed with the hobbies on which broken down and unprincipled politicians are seeking to ride into power. In this, our cause has been grossly libelled by designing politicians, and their organ presses at the North, and public opinion, both north and south, has been most flagrantly abused. Our motives need but to be understood to be respected, and our principles, we believe, need but to be candidly examined, to be embraced. When the people see as we see, they will act as we act, on this great subject, and the "office" to which the true political abolitionist aspires, is that of conveying *truth* to their minds, in its native transparency, untinged with prejudice and unsuspected of sinister ambition.

When we shall succeed in making it the interest of both political parties to nominate such candidates for office as we can conscientiously support, our end will be attained, and our responsibility for the political sin of slavery discharged. Our other duty lies in a wider field. It is the duty of man to man, the influence of mind with mind and of soul with soul. It is an influence whose potency is measured by its purity and its truth.

He who ascendeth into the sanctuary of his neighbor's conscience, must go up thither with clean hands and a pure heart. Were I a southern slaveholder, I would as soon listen to a drunkard's eulogy of temperance, a Judas Iscariot's denunciation of treachery, or a Pontius Pilate's sermon on Christ crucified, as to the labors of a northern abolitionist returning from the ballot box with his fingers gory with the sin of slavery, striving to convince me of its abominations, by what he might unblushingly call "moral suasion," but what I would spurn as impudent hypocrisy. Although he should approach me in the attractive form of a *CLIO* herself, with the honey of Parnassean suasion upon her lips, and the music of heroic numbers upon her tongue, I fear I should, in the depth of an unpoetic indignation, so far forget the prerogative of her sex, and the divinity of the goddess, as to turn upon her and say, in the language of one having authority, "Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

NO. VII.

"The priest of superstition rideth on an ass—that of fanaticism on a tiger."

There is as much truth as piquancy in this motto. Superstition and fanaticism are both philosophically defined and appropriately symbolized in it. The former has claims on my commiseration, my sympathy, my kindly solicitude, which I cannot disregard with impunity. Though a *LOVER OF TRUTH* I am still a *child of frailty*, and have consequently a fellow feeling with human infirmity which chides my satiric pen, and restrains derision at innocent error, however absurd, at honest devotion, however blind. But with fanaticism I hold no fellowship. It is a hyena which gluts itself not on the dead bodies, but on the living rights of men—it is a pirate ship in the ocean of human life, and whether its dark banner exhibit the cross or the crescent, it is alike terrible to the humble bark exploring its onward way over the troubled billows to gain the haven of endless rest.

The charge of fanaticism is hurled at the abolitionists by Mr. Clay and his pro-slavery clansmen, with a malignity which I trust it will ever be foreign from my nature to feel, and a venom beyond my power to reciprocate. Armed with the elements of moral and political philosophy, I have sought to repel their shafts, and if, with these simple weapons, truth bid me carry the war into Carthage, I obey, less to gratify the exulting vengeance of a Scipio, than to subserve the severe and discarded patriotism of

a Cato; more in grief than in resentment; rather to rescue the victim than to chastise the vampire.

Although fanaticism is an evil of Protean forms and shapes, yet it is too often imputed in an unmeaning sense, and employed as an epithet of unpointed denunciation, merely because it is a vice we all agree so cordially in deprecating and condemning. As the candid and sincere votary of truth, however, I take upon myself the responsibility of saying, that this vice is exhibited in its most baleful type, not as is vociferated with overwhelming clamor in abolitionism, but its heterogeneous rabble of opponents. In making this charge, I spare no rank or class, but mean to comprehend all, from the learned D. D. and L. L. D. down to the more excusable, because more innocent *materiel* employed to throw the brick bats to put us down. When I reflect on the sources from which these high sounding academic titles emanate, and witness the miserable sycophancy with which American Theology and American Jurisprudence bend to accommodate the peculiar institutions of the South, and the emulation among our northern colleges to catch slaveholding patronage, I feel that I cannot be over grateful to Lord Bacon for his elements of inductive philosophy, and to the martyrs of protestant Christianity for giving me the Bible in a vernacular tongue. Unlike our opponents, I do not propose to canvass intents, or to scan motives. To do this justly, is the peculiar prerogative of the Searcher of hearts, and it is a species of fanaticism in our opponents, which I detest too much to imitate, by impertinently encroaching on the relation which exists between them and their God. To his own master each one must stand or fall.—But of their avowed principles, the tendency of their actions for good or for evil, the palpable incongruities, manifest inconsistencies and gross absurdities with which their logic and their ethics are *peculiarized* by amalgamation with the “peculiar institution.” I have many uncourtly things to say, and much pain to inflict on those whose feelings are inseparably bound up in the errors of fanaticism.

With such as have the frankness to avow with Mr. Clay that “that is property which the law declares to be property, and two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves to be property,” I have but little ink to shed. They imitate Christians in worshipping but one God, but he is the least erect spirit that fell from heaven. The multiplication of almighty dollars by immortal souls, composes the ritual of their devotional exercise, and as the severest test of supreme devotion, they, in imitation of the votaries of a rival, but less insatiate divinity of old, cause their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire of slavery, the immolated victims of an avaricious Deity. Their hosannas rise in ventriloquial melody from

the pocket attuned to silver sounds and golden numbers. Whether it was Mr. Clay's clear conceptions of this sublime theology which elevated him to the presidential chair of the American Colonization Society, I am not sufficiently versed in the mystic lore of that national *alma mater* of philanthropy to determine. But justice to Mr. Clay requires that I should here admit that his creed, as above expressed and expounded, is more consistent, systematic, and perfect than any other opposed to abolitionism I have yet met with. Like mine, it has the beauty of simplicity to recommend it. Mr. Clay and I agree in detesting a mongrel religion, a divided homage of the heart, an amalgamated devotion. If there be any monsters which receive the universal abhorrence of both heaven and earth, it is that spawn of miscreations which compose the legitimate offspring of the unholy wedlock of Christianity with American slavery. A Christianity thus poisoned, sheds visible darkness on the religion of the 10th century and common sense is fast fleeing from it into mis-called infidelity, in order to preserve fidelity to her own self-evident truths incorporated in our national confession of faith, the declaration of independence. That such is the religion of that peculiar sect of Christians which espouses, defends, winks at, apologizes for, or in any manner accommodates itself to American slavery, as it exists, either in theory or in practice, in bulk or in detail, in the abstract or in the concrete, is asserted, maintained and affirmed. This statement is penned with a deliberation proportioned to the magnitude of the charge it involves, and in language every word of which is carefully weighed in the balance of truth, as revealed to the mind of the writer. If it inflict pain on any of the numerous, and in other respects worthy individuals embraced in it, let it be remembered that it occasioned its author much intenser pain in coming reluctantly as he did to the belief of its truth.

I began this article, Mr. Editor, with an intention of indulging my constitutional vein of antipathy to fanaticism, by castigating it for my own diversion and the amusement of your readers; but the subject is too grave for irony, too painful for derision. I cannot fiddle when Rome is burning. I cannot laugh when slavery is winding its horrid coils round the religion of my country, with a grasp more fell than that of the serpent of Laocoon. My heart forgets its mirth, and my pen its playfulness, when I see the choak damp of slavery, so far palsying the generous impulses of Christian love and natural sympathy, that the American church surveys with morbid tranquility, and within her own folds, the windows of three millions of human souls sealed up in perpetual darkness and exclusion from her own boasted gospel light and liberty. Nor is this immense wrong done under the belief that ignorance is the mother of devotion. I can throw the

mantle of my charity in ample folds over that ecclesiastic who believes in this discarded dogma of a dark age, and with pious care keeps back from my mind the words of eternal life, and teaches me to crucify my common sense, that I may follow his guidance the more implicitly into the mazes of scholastic mysticism, when I see that he is inspired by the noble, the sublime philanthropy of wafting my soul to heaven in a cloud of darkness. He is indeed a fanatic, because he encroaches on my rights. He is a benevolent man, but he does not understand the limits of human responsibility. He oversteps the division line which God has drawn between his duty and mine. He indeed does me a great wrong, but his only error is one which many good but overheated minds may slide into, by not recognizing the important, but somewhat abstract principle that the end does not justify the means, I may admire the fanatic, but I must deprecate the fanaticism.

But when I see a Christian in the 19th century, to whom these dogmas of a dark age are but ill remembered like other legendary lore, by whom their absurdities are derided with just severity, committing the same wrong in a much greater degree, not for the benefit of the victim's soul, but that he may appropriate the mechanical powers of the body in which it is entabernacled; that he may make merchandize of the *muscle* which God has lent that soul as an instrument to serve him with, he exhibits the climax of fanaticism, without leaving room to invent a higher motive than the grossest mammon worship. To chattelize the man, is not merely to encroach on his rights, but it is by one fell swoop, to annihilate them all. To talk about loving him after he is thus transmuted is sinful. The same apostle who enjoins on us so fervently the law of love to one another, forbids us loving the world or the *things* which are in it. Christianity, therefore, is vitally interested in correctly settling the question whether the slave is in the eye of God a *thing* which we are forbidden to love, or a *man*, whom we are required to love as ourselves, and with whom both natural and revealed religion enjoin us to reciprocate the moral duties of the golden rule.

NO. VIII.

In my last essay, I began with pointing out the relationship which abolitionism bears to fanaticism, and was thence drawn into a train of reflections exposing the cis-Atlantic heresy of attempting to reconcile Christianity with American slavery. I did this under the consciousness that the views expressed would be condemned as ultra and over severe by the great mass of my

fellow citizens of all religious persuasions, and accustomed as I am to think and act with the many, and to find in their honest and sober convictions an enlightened public opinion which has heretofore corresponded substantially with my own, it cost me not only many misgivings of judgment, but some reluctance of feeling (though constrained by the clear and irresistible convictions of truth,) to renounce so popular an error, and expose obnoxious heresies which, till recently, I have, in common with others, entertained on this momentous question. To prevent misconstruction, therefore, let those who esteem my remarks harsh, and unseasoned with charity, remember that they are directed against principles and doctrines, which the writer, till recently, entertained with as little consciousness of impure motive, as he now feels in exposing their absurdities. The only sin on this subject which he considers himself guilty of having committed, and of which he is now striving to bring forth fruit meet for repentance, is that of letting slip from his memory the old horn-book proverb—"He who cannot reason is a fool; he who dare not reason is a slave; he who will not reason is a bigot."

With this explanation, I hope to be indulged in speaking my complaints freely and fully on the present state of public opinion, not so much among those who justify slavery, as those who adopt the sentiment more fashionable this side of Mason and Dixon's line, but less consistent, of opposing slavery in the abstract, and apologizing for its present existence as a necessary evil, to be repented of, perhaps, by this generation, but not to be forsaken (if at all) for two or three generations to come—who trust to the silent and benign influence of Christianity, which (say they) is now at work upon it, and is gradually, and as it were by stealth, mitigating its evils, and will ultimately accomplish its own perfect work by dissolving the chains of slavery—that in order to effect this, Christianity and slavery must be allowed to commingle their influences in harmony and reciprocal good feeling, undisturbed by the evil genius of northern abolitionism—that slavery is one of the political institutions of the country, and consequently to interfere with it in any other way than by these indirect influences, would be making Christianity a political, or church and state religion—that notwithstanding all that is said to the contrary, the slaves are happy and contented in their sphere, and under all the circumstances it is impossible to make them more so by emancipation. These are the most popular and efficient, and apparently the most Christian arguments used against anti-slavery action, that I have been able to collect, and to them I propose devoting the much too narrow limits of this essay in soberly examining.

Conceding, as these several classes of objectors do, that slave-

ry is sinful, they seem to forget that the proper time to repent of that, and all other sins, is to-day, and the proper time to forsake it, is simultaneous with such repentance. Slavery is, indeed, a peculiar institution, and a complicated sin; but there is nothing either peculiar or complicated in the mode of forsaking it when sincerely repented of. The moral government of God is so regulated that he never has occasion to caution a repenting sinner not to derange it by forsaking sin too suddenly. The sin of slavery is forsaken by doing as was done in Antigua and Bermuda—give back to the slave immediately his usurped rights, and restore him to his denied manhood. If you think (what experience proves to be fallacious,) that in consequence of his being born and bred in bereavement of those rights, he cannot at first use them discreetly, teach him how to use them. It is a task which angels might covet to share in, and would be more grateful to a truly philanthropic mind than that of teaching the laws of vision to a man born blind, who had been newly couched for a cataract. The idea of holding a man in slavery for his own good, in order to prepare him for freedom, is running counter to the Protestant maxim already commented on, that the end does not justify the means. Both common sense and Christianity, therefore, agree in the theory that restitution of usurped rights should be the first step towards forsaking the sin of slavery, and if these high and concurrent authorities need the practical corroboration of human experience, it is to be found in the glorious experiment of British West Indian emancipation, which is not only a living, and blazing, and much needed proof to this nation that righteousness is profitable to all things, but also illustrates, with singular aptitude, the position here contended for, by showing the advantages of immediate emancipation over the apprenticeship system.

What hope have we that the kind of Christianity we have heretofore had in our country will eradicate slavery? When primitive Christianity and Roman slavery came in contact, they were as alien to each other in origin as in nature. The demon of slavery had then just achieved his triumph over Roman virtue, Roman patriotism and Roman liberty, but he never quailed. he never felt how awful virtue is, till assailed by the sword of the Spirit, as wielded by the primitive champions of the cross. But American slavery is a bantling of our own religion; it was born and bred, cradled and nurtured, in the bosom of our own boasted protestant orthodoxy, and from recent intelligence, it may well be doubted, that if weaned from the American church and colonized in Mahometan Egypt, it would not have occasion to complain of the very *unchristian* and barbarous inhospitalities it would receive from the Grand Pacha and his despotic edicts. To suppose, therefore, that the church has marked out

her own overgrown nursling as a victim of a wasting consumption, which has been preying upon its vitals these sixty years past, is no more ridiculous than it is absurd, to any one who casts a glance at the statistics of American slavery, and at the increasing indulgence and suavity with which it is treated by the American church.

But a more serious, because more popular delusion on this subject, is the belief that the church has no jurisdiction over slavery, because it is a political institution, and cannot therefore be disturbed without meddling with politics. No one would deprecate more than myself, the interference of clerical influence in promoting or defeating an independent treasury bill, a deposite law, a national bank, or tariff law, or any other measure purely political in its character, however important. But while the ambassador of Christ keeps aloof from, and soars above all these questions of secular excitement, and remembers that his Master's kingdom is not of this world, he should also remember that the jurisdiction of that kingdom is co-extensive with moral evil, and takes cognizance of human depravity in all its forms; that sin has no sanctuary of refuge behind the throne of political power, nor can the sword of the Spirit be arrested, or the Word of the LORD return void, because it finds iniquity protected by a human statute. I am opposed to an alliance of church and state, not so much because I fear a tax may be levied on my property to support a religious sect with whom I do not worship, as to preserve the ambassador of Christ free from the temptations and snares of secular influence, that he may stand forth in a dignity and independence befitting his embassy, and not shun to declare, without secular fear, favor or hope of reward, all the counsel of God to a sinful world. But when I hear the clerical cant, now growing so fashionable, of baptizing a slave code or any other municipal law of this republican country by the name of an "ordinance of God," I think those Reverend gentlemen who would do so, should spend a winter in Albany or Washington, under the tuition of their parishioners of the lobby, and witness the log-rolling, team-hitching, and all the other machinery and appliances by which these "ordinances" are concocted, planned and matured in the shape of bank bills, railroad charters, canal and other appropriations. When Nero was emperor and Paul a prisoner exhorting the church at Rome to yield obedience to the powers that be, he might with propriety speak of the decrees of that anti-christian tyrant, as the ordinances of God, and with equal propriety may the poor American slave, with his face ground in the earth, in the exercise of the same Christian meekness and resignation, speak of the iron, anti-human statute under which he is oppressed, especially when he sees his supposed petition to Congress for relief, throw that body into a paroxysm of rage. But

when a Christian people are the law-makers, and a Christian ministry has the guidance of their conscience, to hear those ministers talk about the most diabolical code of laws that ever disgraced human legislation, as an ordinance of God, is, to speak with all possible delicacy, a glaring absurdity. If, instead of doing so, they were to come out boldly, and in the spirit and power of the gospel, denounce this hydra sin, I doubt not but that the influence of Christianity over the conscience of this nation, is adequate to effect its immediate overthrow and abolition. The doctrine that slavery is sinful, is peculiarly popular, and easily proved to a republican citizen. In fact, it is so generally believed, although not preached, that the contrary doctrine, when taught by some of our clergymen, is not believed by one in a hundred of a disinterested American congregation. The great fault lies with the clergy in preserving either a mysterious nour-committalism about the sinfulness of slavery, or conceding it to be sinful, they preserve a still less excusable silence on its heinousness and the necessity of forsaking it. The consequence of this neglect is seen in the vague, sophistical and vascillating state of public opinion in every thing appertaining to slavery, and the ridiculous quandary into which a large majority of those who intend to be conscientious are thrown, whenever the ethics of the slave code come in conflict with those of Christianity.

To refute the position that slaves are happy, and that their happiness would not be augmented by restoring to them the rights given them by their Creator, would result in a question involving the existence of original *stamina* of mind itself, and consequently can only be determined by the disputant's own consciousness. If he has such consciousness no higher evidence can be furnished him; if he has it not, an attempt to prove its existence in others, would be like discoursing to a man born blind on the beauties of the rainbow. So thick a *drop serene* has quenched the visual orbs of his mind, that a deeper, a more tender sympathy is due to his bereavement than is drawn out by the blind bard in describing his own sightless eyeballs rolling in vain to catch the eternal, co-eternal beams of holy light. He who can mistake the thoughtless, the morbid laugh, or dance, or song, of a human spirit, broken down and scathed by slavery's darkness and chains, for happiness and contentment, would mistake the sickly glitter of the sun-dog, for the vivid beams of the Lord of day; he would mistake the ecstacy of a maniac dancing in his chains, for that peace of God which passeth all understanding.

NO. IX.

The leading design of this review is to indicate unpopular truth from the mystifications with which its very axioms are sought to be impeached by the expediency politicians and casuists of the day. I have heretofore attempted to reason with those who reason, in answering the manifold objections made to anti-slavery action, which are grouped together with much ingenuity and spread out with the characteristic frankness and fearlessness of their author in the able and eloquent speech under review. Holding, as I am more than ever convinced I do, the vantage ground of truth in the momentous question in controversy, I have found my task an easy one, and to me, as interesting as easy. And for the purpose of enabling those who differ from me to assail my positions with facility, I have felt it due to the cause of truth, to which my pen is professedly consecrated, to study a clearness, simplicity and artlessness of style worthy of the gigantic principles examined, the magnitude of interests involved, and the mighty issue for time and for eternity, conceived to divide at every point the principles, doctrines and measures of slavery and of anti-slavery.

Believing, as I do, that truth is essentially co-eternal with its infinite Source, and is the right arm of Omnipotent power in the government of the rational universe, and that error, however specious, and delusion, however gaudy, are but the bubbles which dance on the great tide of human life for the moment, and straightway return to their native nonentity; believing, too, that the most meritorious service we can render our country, and the most acceptable to our God, is the practical advancement of a great political and moral truth—I did hope that some one of its votaries, covetous of the rich reward which I can assure them springs from so delightful a task, would, ere this, have sought occasion to correct some one of the many positions deemed erroneous which I have taken in the course of this review. But I would ask those professed republicans of the Jeffersonian school, who mouth his maxim that "truth is mighty and will prevail," when will that might be made manifest? when will that prevalence be attained? If, like them, this discussion produces no other emotion than disgust, and generates in their minds no other idea than they express by the word (?) "*slimsy*." Among these pretended disciples of that great expounder of the rights of man, the very thought of a discussion of those rights—the very sight of an anti-slavery document suddenly brings on a revulsive shudder not unlike hydrophobial rage; and the unhappy

victim, though otherwise every thing that is amiable and kind, is suddenly transformed into a fury, when the limpid streams of anti-slavery truth are brought to sparkle in his vision.

As Mr. Clay has occupied the whole field of both argument and declamation, and nothing new or essentially different is presented by the Reverend *alumnus* of Princeton college, whose address the readers of the Commercial Herald are invited to peruse again and again, in answer to my arguments, I shall not be required to digress from my text in the notice I am called on to take of the high wrought and strong appeal he has made to abolitionists to desist from further action. The single idea which constitutes the *nucleus* of both Mr. Clay's and Mr. McDowall's eloquence is, that abolitionists must abandon their measures, because the slaves, when freed, will rise up and wage a war of extermination not only against their former masters, but ultimately against us at the north also. Conceding the indisputable point, that slavery is a moral evil, their appeal is based on their fears that the path of duty is not the path of safety; that an undisturbed continuance in sin, is the only mode of escaping the punishment due to that sin; that although the enslavement of a human being is a great violation of the golden rule of duty from man to man, the very consciousness that it is such, is made the foundation of an argument to persevere in it, inasmuch as it is feared that the oppressed will, when released, seek to avenge his wrongs against his oppressor. Such is the logic used by a great statesman in addressing the Senate of the United States; such are the ethics employed by an able Doctor of Divinity in addressing an assembly of brother Divines of the Princeton school. The chivalrous Kentuckian did not tremble when standing before the muzzle of John Randolph's duelling pistol, but his knees smite each other in contemplating the terrible consequences of becoming virtuous. The Princeton Doctor of Divinity, in his much learning, has discovered that the fear of doing justice and of loving mercy is the beginning of wisdom. Both have drank deep draughts of the tragic muse's inspiration, and have labored powerfully to draw pro-slavery tears from anti-slavery eyes, in depicting the horrors of negro cut-throating, carnage and devastation which would follow his immediate emancipation, as the first return of gratitude he would render for his restored manhood. To refute this position in the minds of those who would not deride it, I am quite sensible it would be in vain to prove that by the constitution of the human heart, it is not in man, (monsters of course excepted,) to smite the hand that feeds him, or to thirst for the blood of his deliverer—that it would also be in vain to remind them, that there is a God who still takes some little cognizance of the affairs of men, and that he delights in virtue. These old fashioned truisms, I would be told, are

very fine in the abstract, and compose an interesting and pretty Sundry School lesson for children ; but wise Senators and learned Doctors of American Theology, are taught to condemn their simplicity, and to take prudential lessons from the more complex science (falsely so called) of practical expediency, in which school the fidgeting spirit of circumstance is the oracle of the hour, the expounder of a chameleon morality, the Doctor of a topical Divinity. In order, therefore, to answer these orators and their political and religious disciples, it is of little service to deal in what Mr. Clay calls the "sublime abstractions." I will therefore, have to descend from anti-slavery faith to anti-slavery works, from the evidence of things not seen to those that are seen, with a view of ascertaining what lion is in the way so terrible to those who walk by sight on this subject.

If there is any thing that looks like ultraism in abolition movements, it is in the untiring perseverance and avidity with which they seek after facts and statistics touching the subject of slavery. It has accordingly been a standing challenge of the anti-slavery society, to show a single instance in which a freed African slave has attempted the life of his former master ; and notwithstanding the empty rant of pro-slavery politicians and divines, none of them have yet ventured to take up the gauntlet. If these dignitaries in church and state would condescend to look into an anti-slavery library, and examine the history of abolitionism for the 19th century, they would find such statistics as the following staring them in the face, in which not a drop of blood was spilt :

On the 10th of October, 1811, the Congress of Chili decreed that every child born after that day should be free.

On the 9th of April, 1812 the government of Buenos Ayres ordered that every child born after January 15, 1813, should be free.

On the 19th of July, 1821, the Congress of Colombia passed an act emancipating all slaves who had borne arms in favor of the Republic, and providing for the emancipation in 18 years, of the whole slave population, consisting of 280,000 souls.

On the 15th of September, 1821. the government of Mexico granted instantaneous and unconditional emancipation to every slave.

On the 4th of July, 1827, the state of New York emancipated 10,000 slaves.

On the 1st of August, 1834, the British Parliament emancipated, by immediate liberation and apprenticeship, 780,993 slaves in their West India Islands, in which the aggregate number of white population was only 129,108, or less than one white inhabitant to six liberated slaves. In Antigua and Bermudas, the liberation was instantaneous, and in the former island there

were 29,537 liberated slaves to 1,980 white inhabitants, or about fifteen to one.

One word on what is denounced by this Princeton divine as a "pragmatical" interference with slavery by northern abolitionists, and I close this number. Mr. Clay and his political and clerical allies, are incessantly telling us that southern slavery is no concern of ours. I have heretofore explained to what extent slavery is directly and politically ours, for good and for evil, as *citizens* or *electors*, by pointing out the extent of the constitutional power of Congress over it, but the voice of nature loudly proclaims to us as *men*, that this is but the beginning of our responsibility—that all the members of the human family are bound to each other by a thousand ligaments, which no political power, however despotic, can sever—that no one, though he be the least of those little ones for whom Christ died, can be thrust down from his exalted birthright of personality, and graded with cattle in the stall, or merchandize in the wareroom, without wounding the deepest sympathies of our common nature, and drawing forth an acclamation from every unsophisticated heart, that the destroyer has come, the encampment of humanity has been violated, and high treason has been committed against the commonwealth of man. But when, not one, but three millions of our race are thus detrudded, when the cattle trade is not only introduced into the human family, but our own countrymen are bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, branded with initials, invoiced, shipped in cargoes, stored as goods, taken in execution, knocked off under the auctioneer's hammer—when all this is done, not only among our countrymen, but in the bosom of our own church, and one Christian shows his brotherly love, the evidence of his discipleship, by driving to the human flesh market, a cofle of his brethren dearly beloved in the Lord, and after receiving the pieces of silver in exchange for their souls and bodies, he manifests his gratitude to God for sending high prices and a brisk market, by tithing, as was lately done, the price of a man, and casting \$50 into the Missionary box, to spread the gospel of *such* good will to men in heathen lands, to beautify the Pagan hills with the feet of them who bear *such* "sweet tidings," and bring *such* "salvation on their tongues." When all these acts are done in the name of liberty and religion under the sanction of church and state, beneath the hallowed ensigns of the cross, and the star spangled banner, abolitionists think and feel that as men, as patriots, as Christians, they have much to do in this matter—that they must tell this teacher in American Israel, exalted as he stands as a watchman upon the battlements of Zion, that notwithstanding the severity of his denunciations, and the high and holy place from which they are fulminated, we must be indulged in what he considers a "pragmatical" spirit

on this subject. And although we may not be permitted to desecrate a Christian temple with this spirit, we need not profane his Bible with seeking a justification for it, but we will take our stand on the broad platform of humanity, and in the one sanctuary which the God of nature has spread over our heads, we will vindicate this pragmatismal spirit, by that elder inspiration which He has revealed to our every heart, and which an ancient Doctor of this truly Catholic Divinity, though a despised African slave, thus expounds in the pure orthodoxy of nature, that may well mantle with a burning blush the professors of our peculiari-
 zed Theology. "I am a man," says this heathen philanthropist, "and nothing relating to man can be foreign from my bosom."*

NO. X.

MR. EDITOR:

Having canvassed such of the topics and positions contained in Mr. Clay's speech as seem relevant to the moral and political questions growing out of the toleration of American slavery; I feel that it is unnecessary, and perhaps inexpedient, to avail of your indulgence in the further pursuit of an almost inexhaustible subject. In the event of any of your readers questioning the correctness of the view I have taken of it, (which they are cordially invited to do,) I may have occasion to resume my pen in the way of reply; but with the few supplementary remarks here made, I lay it aside for the present, and tender you my sincere thanks for the generous and liberal kindness extended me in the use of your columns. It is with *Philalethean* sincerity, Mr. Editor, that I assure you I mean no common place civility, and am under no ordinary emotions in doing so.

When I consider the treatment received by the scattered and faithful few who assumed the perilous responsibility of opening their mouth for the dumb, and of daring to sympathise with the millions of my enslaved countrymen and fellow Christians—when I witness the strength and the fierceness of the pro-slavery spirit amongst us in the shape of sectarian conservatism, in religion as well as in politics—when I see abolitionists driven from our churches, and the very announcement of their meeting, from our pulpits, made the signal of brute outrage—when their own temple, with the motto "Virtue, Liberty, and Independence," erected too, in the same city from which the Declaration of Independence emanated, laid in ashes—when I see their petitions, interceding for the rights of man, spurned from the throne of consti-

* "Homo sum, et humani a me nil alienum puto."—TERENCE.

tutional power—when I am told, as I have lately been, by a much venerated Doctor of Divinity, the conductor of a religious paper, that the subject of American slavery was extraneous to Christianity, and foreign to the one “*evangelical faith*,” to the advancement of which, “*in Apostolic order*,” his press was exclusively devoted, and that consequently it was not meet for me to commune through the columns of his paper, with brethren of our own Zion touching the question, whether as such, we had any duties to discharge respecting slavery—under all these and numerous similar circumstances, too notorious to need naming, I feel it to be almost a peculiar prerogative, instead of a common birthright, to enjoy the use of an unshackled press, and to be allowed the exercise of that liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, in whispering a word of truth, and breathing a sigh of commiseration, through the columns of a secular paper, in behalf of down-trodden and crucified humanity.

It will be seen that in the course of this review, my design has been merely to show that American slavery was intrinsically and radically anti-christian and anti-republican, and to answer the various objections, vacillating and fugitive as they are, raised against the use of all our political and moral power for its immediate abandonment and abolition. How great an evil it is, I have not been called on to describe, nor has this review led me to notice its abuses. My attention has been confined to its simple theory as defined by its own code or system of laws. All I have said relates to the machine itself, and is believed to be true whether that machine is moved by the hand of a Howard or a Caligula, whether its devoted victims are underfed or overfed, underworked or overworked, underflogged or overflogged. It is the contemplation of its acknowledged principles, as composing a portion of our national republicanism, and as the stock into which the vine of American Christianity is sought to be engrafted, that prompts me to become an abolitionist. If an impartial and careful examination of those principles will not be sufficient to satisfy others that it is their duty as men, as patriots and as Christians, to take the same course, let them read and criticise on “*American Slavery as it is, or the testimony of a thousand witnesses*,” composed chiefly of the admissions of slaveholders themselves, scrupulously authenticated, disclosing the hitherto but imperfectly revealed horrors of the prison house, in an aspect that would pain the ear and sicken the soul of a Turk, and might well move the latent philanthropy of an Algerine to send a missionary of his faith to our shores to teach us the meaning of “peace on earth and good will to men.”

It may be said as truly of me, as of many others that have written in behalf of the enslaved, that harsh and offensive epithets are employed, and an apology may be expected before lay-

ing down my pen for doing so. This objection is made, not only by the slaveholder and his apologist, but by the wary non-committalist and the polished non-pragmatical abolitionist, whose labors against slavery begin and end in drawing-room sentimentalism. Let these and all other neutral powers in this warfare, remember that, unlike our opponents, we renounce the use of carnal weapons. We are not attacking men, but their principles; not motives, but doctrines; not judging hearts, but rectifying consciences. Let them also remember that the ethics of the abolitionist and of the slaveholder are, in their nature, intrinsically and inflexibly opposed to each other at every point, so much so, that we can conscientiously agree in but one thing, and that is, to treat a mediator as a common enemy. I will illustrate my views on this point by an example. It will be remembered by your readers, Mr. Editor, that I was charged with committing a crime which would be esteemed by the slaveholder "morally corrupt as stealing," in facilitating a fugitive slave in his passage from this port to Queen Victoria's dominions. The epithet of stealing, though perhaps not technically correct, would certainly not be without point, if it had been a runaway horse I had been instrumental in conveying beyond his owner's reach, and I should certainly earn the pity of universal contempt, if I were to take exceptions to the propriety of the epithet, and invoke public sympathy because my injured neighbor did not "pinch the miserable plaits of his phraseology" into a more courtly style in defining the wrong I had done him. I must therefore be content to be put down in his ethical code as a thief, for such acts as these, and he does my memory no injustice, nor can I esteem it an unfriendly office, if he engraves the theft on my tomb stone when I am dead. But the same act which his religion teaches him to shudder at with pious horror as a felony, mine plumes with the heaven-descended, the seraphic name of Mercy. In every particular but one, our ethical principles are alike. The single point on which we split so widely in characterizing the transaction, is the question of title. He believes that his slave is unmanned and embruted by virtue of a human statute, or as Mr. Clay expresses it, "that is property which the law declares to be property, and two hundred years of legislation have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves to be property." I believe that man holds title to himself by the gift of his Creator, not mediately but immediately—not as a sub-tenant, but as tenant in chief—not by virtue of a deed of manumission under the sign manual of his fellow being, which he must carry in his pocket, but by virtue of the letters patent of the Almighty, the broad seal of which, bearing the image and superscription of its Divine original, is enstamped on his mind, and illumines his countenance with an inherent authenticity, which the despoiling

hand of slavery itself cannot wholly extinguish. Nor is this heaven-descended chart bereft of its validity, because the patentee happens to draw his natal air under the shadow of the star-spangled banner, rather than in an African Kroal. Whatever difference an American congress may in its protective tariff wisdom have discovered between the foreign and domestic slave trade, the one is piracy equally with the other, in the criminal code of Heaven, and the infant soul that is nailed to the cross of slavery at its birth, cries in thunder tones to heaven, that some other reason be rendered for its enslavement, than that the baleful star of its nativity threw it into the fangs of one who was signed with the sign of the cross at an American baptismal fount.

But suppose we turn the tables and apply our creeds to his conduct. His moral sense and mine agree in recognizing as correct the definition of theft laid down in our law books, viz: taking what belongs to another without his consent, and converting it to our own use for the sake of gain. If the slaveholder's creed is correct on the question of ownership, he is above reproach, and to vindicate his conduct before God and man, he need but stand up boldly, in the consciousness of his rectitude of heart, and render his strong reasons in vindication of his creed, to the dismay and confusion of us fanatics of the North. If our creed be correct—if it is not a mere figure of speech, a mere "theoretical flourish" for a human being to say, *my* hands and *my* feet, *my* head and *my* heart, *my* body and *my* soul, then the slaveholder stands confessed a MAN-STEALER. "How much better," asks the Saviour of our race, in tremendous emphasis, "how much better is a man than a sheep?" When that question is answered, I can tell the haughty and chivalrous slaveholder, to whom northern patriotism and northern piety bend so obsequiously, how much more abominable, in the etiquette of the sanctuary, is the man thief than the sheep thief.

But it is urged that it is ruinous to our cause, and highly inexpedient to press such severe truths, (if truths they are,) inasmuch as it only exasperates the slaveholder, and induces him to wreak his vengeance on his victim, by augmenting his sufferings. To this very popular objection, we reply that we have no evidence that such is the effect of our measures, but much to the contrary; nor can we believe such an absurdity without evidence. This class of objectors do our opponents great injustice. We are not contending with demons, but with men, many of whom have both sound heads and honest hearts, and need but to be convinced of their duty, to discharge it. Others need but to have the unconscious prejudices of a pro-slavery education brushed away, and a third class, like some of our abolitionists, are trimming between God and mammon, and are ready to forsake the

admitted sin of slavery when they are indemnified for practising so unprofitable a virtue. This last is the most difficult class we have to deal with. None are so reprobate, so insane, so regardless of both God and man, as bootlessly to sink themselves into a deeper perdition, in both character and conscience, than they must all suspect themselves to be, on the slavery question. We propose to deal justly with all; to ply our moral axioms and iron linked syllosyms to the mind and conscience of the honest hearted, and to hold up the others with their deeds to the gaze of the world, and place them in the focus of our anti-slavery lens, where we are satisfied the burning rays of natural and revealed truth will soon convince them that they must surrender either their victim or their character. Public opinion is so fast gathering potency on this subject throughout the Christian world, and we have such a vast magazine of facts and moral truth, that the slave must either be unfettered, or his oppressor's character burnt to a crisp and charred to the core, as black as the hated skin of his victim.

One word to the whigs and the democrats, so called, before closing. It is for the great cardinal principle which lies at the foundation of Jeffersonian democracy, which he incorporated in the *magna charta* of our liberties, and illustrated in his subsequent life and writings, that we are contending. It is for that pearl of great price, which the whigs of '76, in the day which tied men's souls, sold all that they had to purchase, that our strife is. If the mantle as well as the name, of these illustrious progenitors had fallen on the democrats and whigs of this day, they would blush at the comparatively small contest with which they are agitating the nation, respecting an Independent Treasury, a National Bank, or a Land bill, and would strike for their country's salvation, and the hopes of our race, bound up in it, by vying with each other in uncompromising hostility to slavery. That the days of American slavery are numbered, cannot be doubted by those who believe that the ear of the Almighty has not waxed heavy by lapse of time, that He cannot, as hitherto, hear the cries of suffering humanity; or his right arm enfeebled by length of days, that it cannot work out for the oppressed his wonted deliverance. This people imagine a vain thing, if they expect much longer to assemble on their national birth day, and insult the throne of Eternal Justice, by raising hypocritical hands to heaven, in gratitude for their goodly heritage, with their heel planted on their brother's neck, and three millions of slaves raising, in vain, their supplicating hands to them as high as their chains will permit, and crying, "am I not a man and a brother?" It does not rest with us to say, whether slavery shall be perpetuated or prolonged, but it does rest with us to say, whether its requiem shall be the jubilant trump of universal liberty, at the sound

of which, our floods will clap their hands, and our hills will be joyful together before the Lord; or whether slavery shall go down in violence, and some such tragedy be enacted in our land as is darkly prefigured in the apocalypse, and the wine press of God's wrath be trodden against this nation, till blood shall come out even unto the horse bridles.

It is predicted by some politicians and their organ presses, that abolition is dying away. When that prediction is fulfilled, mine is, that the die of this nation is cast forever, and the days of its probation accomplished. It will then be in vain for us to say, "we have a Washington, a Franklin, a Schuyler, a Hamilton, a Jay or a Jefferson for our fathers." The same God who has in the history of our race, so uniformly and so signally made bare his arm to rescue the oppressed from the jaws of oppression, and who has emblazoned the pages of profane as well as sacred history with the great truth, that human liberty is as the apple of his eye, will, (if need be,) raise up a greater than Washington, a braver and wiser than his renowned compeers, out of these despised slaves. When the battle is the Lord's, as it most emphatically will be on that day, this nation knows full well, by striking proof, to its joy and triumph, what will be again exhibited, to its shame and confusion, that numbers avail nothing. In that strife our standard bearers will faint, and the star spangled banner be trodden under foot as a vile thing. The besom of destruction will, in righteous indignation, sweep a pro-slavery Christianity from the consecrated soil it pollutes, and the watchword at her temple gates will be "rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof."

PHILALETHES.

CLERICAL DELINQUENCIES.

In giving the foregoing remarks a wider publicity than was originally designed, it is deemed proper to append in a more specific shape than was called for by the review of a political speech, a few observations on the aspect in which slavery is presented to the American Church, or rather the Divinity Schools of our country. The most striking and prominent feature of this relation, is in the fact that the great body of the American clergy, who agree in letting slavery alone, and in opposing directly or indirectly the anti-slavery enterprise, is nearly equally divided in numbers, in learning and in influence, on the cardinal question whether slavery is in itself sinful or not. That a question of this magnitude should have escaped a critical discussion so long, and in a country where its decision would have so practical a bearing on the life and conduct of the great body of professing Christians in our country, is certainly very extraordinary. On the more technical questions of theological science, such as church organization, the mode of administering the ritual ordinances of the church, the ordination of the ministry, together with the theory of original sin, the fall of man, the plan of salvation, &c., ponderous folios have issued from the press, wire-drawn arguments have been ingeniously spun out, much clerical acumen has been expended, and nice biblical criticism has been resorted to. The midnight oil has been consumed in ransacking the dusty lore of antiquity for collateral evidences, and in spelling out the moth-eaten pages of oriental literature for helps to prop up or pull down a sectarian dogma of so little practical utility that its belief or disbelief would have no sensible effect on the heart or the hand of a Christian in keeping those two great commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets. But on the question whether God is pleased or displeased when he sees one portion of his children enslaving the other—whether the code of Christian love and that of American slavery are coincident in all their bearings and ramifications, the champions of christianity have joined a mighty issue—an issue involving a simple and elementary question in moral philosophy, but which, rightly understood, transcends in magnitude and in its practical results, for good or for evil, any question ever before presented to the human mind, the authenticity of Divine Revelation hardly excepted. But on the solution of the question, a silence, dead and ominous is observed on both sides. Why is

this? Why should the parties belligerent sleep on their armor when so glorious a field is to be lost or won? Why this spurious liberality, which, in order to join hands in Christian fellowship, liberates heads and hearts from principles repugnant as those which sunder them from Turk or Jew? Why should so living, so working a faith as the affirmative of this question involves, be strangled in the meshes of denominational conservatism? Must the tree of Christian fellowship bloom upon the sepulchre of dead faith? Must the God of truth be worshipped with a per centage of the heart, from a fear that a torpid repose may be disturbed, or a sectarian prejudice jostled? Surely in such an issue, silence is delinquency, and compromise disgrace. In conducting such a controversy, the rules of forensic etiquette should be, that none be accounted stupid, but those who view the question with indifference, and none dishonest but those who oppose its discussion.

Why is this question so exciting? If we look at the fountain head of the discordant feelings elicited by its discussion, we find on the anti-slavery side of the issue, a single principle claimed to be elementary and inextinguishable—a principle springing out of common and primitive birthrights, whose aliment is that in-born and uninstructed sympathy which teaches every unsophisticated heart, without the aid of revelation, that God has made of one blood all nations of men—a principle which dignifies its possessor with the consciousness, that if there be any attribute of God whose similitude in man has survived the fall, if there be any indwelling spirit in his heart which the apostle forbids us to quench, it is that highest and holiest of living impulses which seeks to relieve innocence from suffering, which loves to open its mouth for the dumb, and which triumphs in breaking the bands of oppression. The active powers of this principle are highly contagious and not untruly called incendiary by its opponents. Its mode of action, its measures, its means and its end, as organized in the anti-slavery enterprise, our opponents have been again and again invited to scrutinize. If a doubt could ever flit across the mind of an abolitionist that his feet were on the rock of truth, it must be scouted forever from his understanding when he surveys the shuffling, time-serving, earth-born and contradictory character of the arguments employed against him. The monster, error, with his many heads and shapeless body, was never more distinctly manifested than in the voluminous array of warring elements that are enlisted against anti-slavery action.

I have said that the Doctors of American Divinity are nearly equally divided on the question whether slavery is intrinsically sinful or not. The line which would divide them, I am sorry to say, is more geographical than sectarian. On the south side of

Mason and Dixon's line, the opinion is fast assuming a dreadful uniformity that slavery is indeed a patriarchal, a heaven-approved institution, while on the north side of that line, such belief is yet mainly confined to a portion of the Episcopal clergy, and those of other denominations whose minds and consciences are moulded in the school of Princeton Divinity. In the preceding pages I have had occasion to expose that jesuitism which admits slavery to be a moral evil, but denies that the pulpit, which is, or should be, the only source of moral power, ought to assail it—that it is a political evil, but the ballot-box, the only source of political power, must not be brought to bear on it.

It is not my design to pursue in detail, what is called the bible argument of the slavery question. That has already been done by the much abler pen of Mr. Weld, in the sixth number of the Anti-slavery Examiner. To that work I would refer the biblical critic for an invincible and triumphant vindication of the Old Testament Scriptures from what common sense must pronounce the blasphemous charge of a slavery approving God. It is not my province or calling to criticise nicely the sacred writings. I search them with the optics of such common sense as God has vouchsafed me; but if all their denunciations of fraud, oppression, injustice, grinding the face of the poor—if all their injunctions of honesty, justice, brotherly love, charity, kindness, pity, &c., were expurgated, and no other doctrine touching the sin of slavery than the great head of the church taught as the fundamental principle of his religion, it would be enough. "*Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye the same to them, for this is the law and the prophets.*" This text, as I understand it, lays the axe to the root of either American slavery or common sense. There are two things in it which, to my mind, convey high evidence of its superhuman wisdom. One is, that the willing or volition principle of the rational mind is clothed with authority to adjudicate between our self and our fellow man. This calls into exercise the reasoning functions of the judge. The other is that a law, or standard principle is given for its guidance, so easy of comprehension that the humblest intellect which God ever made cannot fail to perceive it, and the most sordid and depraved selfishness cannot effectually darken the mind to the perception of its application. The rule given by which to test the rectitude of the scales of justice, and ascertain if the fulcrum by which we suspend them is not nearer our neighbor's scale than our own, is simply to interchange the weights. If on doing so, the equiponderance is still preserved, we may be sure that immutable justice is rendered. To perform this operation, or to comprehend its theory, requires as little skill in moral, as in physical science. But as there are two similar scales in the physical balance, so there are

two independent and inviolable wills, having co-ordinate powers, in the moral. If the subject matter of the negotiation contemplate mutual benefits, the right to propose, is co-equal with, and predicated upon the correlative right to concur or non-concur in such proposal. If it be not a contract involving reciprocal advantages, but a mere benefaction, the beneficiary has surely as good a right to his option in saying whether he will accept, as the supposed benefactor has in saying he will confer. The universal law of contracts or conventional diplomacy, rests on the uncontrolled exercise of the volition principle expressed by the word "would," in the golden rule. Without the inviolable exercise of this principle, the beam of the scales, instead of playing on a pivot, would be fastened in a vice. But slavery, in its mildest definition, means involuntary servitude. To suppose, therefore, that one man is willing to have his functions of volition so effectually supplanted by those of another as to become his slave, is to suppose that the immortal soul thirsts for annihilation, that the will of man has resolved to break its own sceptre, and the mind to abdicate its throne and surrender its empire to another. But slavery is even worse than this. It supposes a forcible invasion. It supposes the sceptre to be broken, and the empire subdued by a hostile arm. The moment a transaction between man and man, ceases to be a contract or meeting of minds, the common law of all nations, and the common sense of all mankind. (the slaveholder and his apologist excepted;) ranks it not only below the standard of God's righteousness, but of man's also, and designates it by the technical name of a wrong, tort, injury, misfeasance, &c., all of which mean trespass, or aggressive injustice, not consequential but intrinsic wrong, in itself. If there be any resemblance, therefore, between the slaveholder's ethics and the *golden rule*, (except the *brazen* impudence with which he seeks to justify his conduct under it,) it is not palpable to my obtuse perceptions.

The rule is limited by its own terms, to human beings possessed of mature and sane minds. It does not assume to regulate the conduct or moral responsibility of children, or idiots, or lunatics, but of "men." Those human bodies which God has sent into the world without a human or rational will, and those whom he has bereaved of such function by disease, must of course, be protected and governed by the will of another. These exceptions, if they are such, but illustrate the reason and moral of the rule. On a somewhat similar principle, it is lawful to coerce the will of the child, so far as is proper to train it up in the way it should go. But even here, in this adolescent empire, such is God's jealousy of that rampant lust of dominion which rages in the depraved human heart, that He has confided this trust to His own appointed guardian, in whose parental bosom thirst of power

is mollified, and attempered by the strongest affection of the human heart—an affection by which He beautifully assimilates His own love for our race, when He teaches us to call Him “our Father.” When the child is unfortunately bereft of this natural guardian, and is consequently thrown into other arms for protection, what a deep solicitude has not God exhibited, of the abuse of this vicarious power! Not only in His word, but in the heart of every man, the very name of orphan is holy, and clusters around it the best and most active sympathies of the human heart.

If the doctrine assumed by some of our bishops and other Doctors of Episcopal Divinity, that slavery is not intrinsically sinful, be sound, I have, as a churchman, to lay again the foundation stone of Christian orthodoxy, and unlearn the alphabet of moral science. The very strong prejudices of a sectarian education against episcopacy, would never have been overcome in my mind, had I not seen, or thought I saw, that in her courts the God of Nature and the God of Revelation were in an eminent degree identified and worshipped as one God, in the simplicity of truth. I thought I saw, and still think I see, in the harmonious operation of the organic laws under which her ministry is ordained, cumulative evidence of their apostolic origin. I thought I saw, and still think I see, in her rejection of sectarian creeds and categories, invented to measure out an arbitrary orthodoxy to the human mind and conscience, the sure confidence she manifested that evangelic faith is most cordially embraced, and takes deepest root in the human heart, when left unaided by other authority than its own suasive and convincing influence, and that the strongest bond of Christian fellowship, by which rational and liberated minds can be drawn together, and a universal congeniality of religious sentiment attained and perpetuated, was in the adoption of a Catholic liturgical service, concentrating, as ours is universally admitted to do, the pure and radical truths of inspiration. I have heretofore indulged, and still indulge the fond hope, that as philosophy becomes more completely identified with Christianity, she will return, wearied and tempest tossed, from the conflicts and schisms incidental to the tethering of independent minds, to a sectarian creed; and will ultimately find a welcome haven, as tranquil as it is free—a faith as evangelical as it is Catholic, in the bosom of our universal church. That with a feast of reason and a flow of soul, philosophy and religion will yet be united in holy wedlock at her altars—that mercy and truth will yet meet, and walk together about our Zion, and go round about her, till the towers thereof, mark well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that they may tell it to the generation following. But how must such hopes be deferred, when systematic oppression is seen shielded by those towers?—

when slavery, that fell demon, that scouted misanthrope, is seen quietly entrenching its haggard form behind those bulwarks, and finding a welcome sanctuary in those palaces from the world's scorn and detestation?—when consecrated prelates are seen doffing their mitres at the demon's approach, and, in the name of Christ and His Church, raising against its pursuers the war cry of "*fanaticism*," and thereby, in effect, saying to the Southern Moloch, "Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool!"

Much is said, and rightly said, among churchmen, about the necessity of seeking out the old paths, and of looking with a scrupulous jealousy on new measures, new lights, &c. I believe it will not be a very antiquarian research to trace out the origin of that article of Episcopal faith which reconciles Christianity to slavery. I need not go back to those palmy days of the church which immediately succeeded the apostolic age, when the abolition of slavery went hand in hand with the reception of Christianity in the Roman empire. Nor do I even propose to quote, as I might do, pages of what is now discovered to be fanaticism, from the writings of her Fleetwood, her Secker, her Warburton, her Burgess, her Porteus, her Horsley and her Wilberforce. I might refer to the common law of England, her philosophy, her literature, her poetry, as moulded by her established religion, but I will content myself for the present, at least, to rely on the testimony of her sainted Hannah More, who states that it is within her recollection, that the first attempt was made to justify slavery by the Bible. How prone is poor human nature, in its blind guidance, to strain at a gnat and swallow a camel! If a temperance society, in its honest and conscientious zeal to arrest a confessedly wide spread and desolating evil, happens, in the means employed, to accomplish so glorious an end, to adopt a pledge binding its members to practice a little more self denial than we think the scriptural definition of temperance, or the example of Christ and his apostles requires, the ultraism is eagerly exposed, the alarm of Protestant Jesuitism is sounded, and a mountain sized heresy is seen in a piece of puritanism, which hardly deserves to be rebuked with a smile, as an error leaning to virtue's side. But when a society, national in its dimensions, is organized, having for its sole end and aim, the motiveless and abstract enterprise of expatriating from their native soil, from Christian and Republican America, to the shores of Pagan and benighted Africa, a certain description of our freemen—when this society is organized under a constitution devoid of a single moral principle to draw its members together, and consequently virtue and vice can meet on terms of equal orthodoxy, in social fellowship—when the patronage of church and state are alike invoked, and to a great extent enlisted in its service—a society

where pro-slavery cupidity and anti-slavery benevolence have one purse—where the human flesh-monger and the duped philanthropist amalgamate their influence—where the Christian evangelist of the North, and the worshipper of the southern Moloch, take sweet counsel together—a society which frames republican constitutions and laws to impose on a foreign people, reserving to its own impersonal and indefinable self, appellate legislative and judicial authority—a society whose only aliment is that anti-human prejudice, or systematic and gratuitous hatred, which originates in slavery and is limited to slaveholders and their allies, and which is sought to be inflamed to such a degree as to induce the belief that a man and a Christian cannot live on the same continent with his fellow man and fellow Christian, having a skin of a different hue, or but a drop of African blood in his veins; but that there must, as the president of this very orthodox society says in the speech I have been reviewing, be a mutual hostility between the two races, which, unless restrained by the enslavement of the one by the other, would result in a war of extermination. When such a society leans so strongly on Christian benevolence for support, and draws so liberally on the moral and pecuniary patronage of the church for aid, can our Reverend and Rt. Reverend Doctors of Divinity, see in its doctrines and its movements no deviation from the “*old paths*” to rebuke?—nothing in the “*new measures*” invented by this society to reprehend? When did Dr. Hawks, the historian of the church, discover that her law of love was not as Catholic as humanity? At the feet of what Gamaliel of our church did the learned Doctor sit when he received the “*new light*,” which, as a member of the Colonization Society he so zealously and so eloquently expounds and defends? Under whose apostleship was that hate canonized, which arrays Christians against each other in battling the question whether a white or a black skin, a sharp or a flat nose, a thick or a thin lip, shall rank higher in that kingdom, whose only rule of court etiquette is, “*he that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted?*”

When Mr. Crummel, a candidate for holy orders, petitioned the trustees of our Theological Seminary, at their Convention, in June last, to be admitted a student in the Seminary, in preparing himself for the ministry, why did the three Doctors of Divinity, with the Bishop of Pennsylvania at their head, who were on the committee to whom the petition was referred, bring in a report denying that petition? Why not assign some reason for the denial, bearing at least the semblance of canonical authority, when by refusing the petition, they were trampling under foot the statutes by which the institution was governed, and doing Mr. Crummel personal injustice? Why not allow Bish-

op Doane to be heard in dissenting from so singular a report? Perhaps some Episcopalians who love as much as this committee do, to see all things done with decency and in order, would have been interested in listening to the councils of a consecrated father in the church, on so nice a question, brought thus directly before him. But no—the most excellent arrangements of the church forbid it. The proceedings must go to the world through the organ presses of the church, that a canonically approved candidate for her ministry, applies for admission into a seminary instituted for the express purpose of educating her ministers—that such petition is referred, reported on, and, without an assigned reason, and in plain violation of the laws of the institution, rejected by a majority vote of a board of trustees, composed of the Bishops of the church and about one hundred other clerical and lay gentlemen from the different states and territories of the Union, and to crown the mystery, a Bishop dissenting from the resolution, is denied leave to assign his reasons to the board for such dissent, with a view of having them entered on the minutes of their proceedings! Such a record on its face, not only tells every discerning mind of a clap-trap, but that its fabricators are wanting in tact and experience in its construction, which in an assembly of divines, is certainly creditable to their ignorance of political stratagem. A writer under the signature of "*An Episcopalian*," subsequently appears and springs the trap, and unravels the whole mystery in a word, by letting us know that this Mr. Crummel is of African descent! The writer is not known, but poor Mr. C., though not privy to the disclosure, is called upon by his Bishop to do vicarious penance for the sin, by being required to come out publicly, and express his regrets at the publication, under the penalty of being cut off as a candidate for the ministry. This he did not do, and was consequently stricken from the list of clerical candidates. I am not acquainted with Mr. C. personally, or otherwise, but, independent of the sympathies which he ought to feel for his proscribed and persecuted race, if he has a mind competent to grasp the great Catholic truths of our holy faith, which, under the new light of colonization orthodoxy, are so fashionably derided as "sublime abstractions,"—if beneath his dusky skin, there is a heart that pants in unison with mine, for the prosperity of our Zion, he could not express his regrets at the righteous exposure of the earth-born, Babel building wisdom under which he was thrust from the institution.

I do not mean to impeach the motives of his bishop in doing as he did. Far from it. I mean however, to say, that his judgment is not infallible. I mean more than this. I mean to say that if our late and highly esteemed diocesan loved the Lord his God with all his highly gifted mind, with the same measure

of devotion with which, I doubt not, he loves Him with all his heart and soul, he would never have stricken Mr. Crummel's name from the list of candidates for orders—he would have seen in the views expressed by “An Episcopalian,” truths and arguments in an unwelcome form, perhaps, but which an honest mind can never justify itself in rejecting on that account, and which called for the best intellectual labors of his understanding, before he cast them out as heterodox, and cast out poor Crummel from the ministry, for not having an intuitive perception of their heterodoxy.

The Bishop, in subsequently making a very slight correction of the facts stated by “An Episcopalian,” (for he does not deny those above referred to, nor attempt to explain them,) evidently refers to the communication, as an appeal to public feeling, by which he ought not to be influenced. This is far from being satisfactory. It conveys to my mind the insinuation that a Protestant Bishop is not to be arraigned at the bar of public opinion—that he can plead the benefit of the clergy, to a bill preferred in the lay courts of that tribunal. Time was when this heterodoxy was in worse odor among Protestants than it is now becoming. We boast of the political, religious and intellectual freedom of our age and country, but never since the infallibility of the Pope was renounced, was the spirit of *ipse dixitism* rrier than now—never was a greater proneness seen in the church to pin religious faith to a bishop's sleeves, or to substitute the tradition of her elders for the laws of her God. Our esteem for the church, and our regard for her safety, honor and welfare, should be shown in reminding her bishops that their apostolic genealogy, unless connected with a purer, a more living and radical faith than is possessed by other clergy, will neither deserve nor receive much peculiar respect. The blood of Douglass must be evinced, not in the antique heir-loom, the black letter scroll, or the rusty armorials of the herald's office, but in the high resolve, the steadfast purpose, and the valorous achievement of a worthy posterity. As true knights of the cross, let them learn to spurn a triumph gained by base-born and vulgar expedients. Let them cling, as with hooks of steel, to the sublime truths of their ancient faith, and leave the God of Sabaoth to take charge of the victory. Let “ASTRA CASTRA, NUMEN LUMEN,”* be embossed on the shield of Christian Catholicism.

If they wish to convince the world that theirs is indeed the favored channel of grace—that they are in truth the legitimate descendants of that beloved disciple who leaned on the Saviour's breast, let them no longer dabble in the dirty waters of a vile sectional prejudice—let them no longer take counsel of the capricious spirit of a skin deep, man-hating, God-contemning caste;

* The stars my camp, the Deity my light.

but let them read by day, and meditate by night—let them bind upon their fingers the counsel which that highly favored disciple gave them. and gave the proscribed Crummel and his vilified race, when he tells little children to love one another.

This brings me to notice more fully one other "*new measure*" of our church, which, though not yet claimed to be catholic, is becoming very general in this meridian—I mean the anti-discussion spirit. It was this spirit which presided when Crummel's petition was disposed of. It was this spirit which prompted Dr. Rudd to exclude from the Gospel Messenger an unexceptionably temperate inquiry, which I proposed starting through the columns of that paper, whether slavery was sinful or not.—It is this spirit which suppresses a mere notice of an anti-slavery lecture being read in many of our churches. It is this spirit which dictates an ominous silence, a mysterious non-committalism throughout the church, which counsels our clergy to say, we are neither pro-slavery nor anti-slavery—we are neither hot nor cold on this subject; and the harmony and peace of the church must not be disturbed by its discussion. Much as this harmony is to be desired, it is only a virtue when associated with intellectual freedom. Rather than one jot or tittle of the law be suppressed, and much rather than the great question of slavery be smothered, let the church be not only sundered but shivered, till every man's enemies be those of his own household,—till the father shall be divided against the son, and the son against the father—the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother—the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law. Better in these, the days of deep humiliation to the church, that the scattered votaries of her ancient faith, walk together for a season in sackcloth, without a priest, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim. If the little flock should be driven to this extremity, let them fear not, but let the consolation be theirs—let the soul-inspiring courage be theirs—that it is not the first time that evangelical faith has wrestled with, and triumphed over ecclesiastical conservatism.

We occasionally hear the different religious sects talking about high church and low church—a distinction which in these northern states certainly, we ourselves do not recognize; and it is devoutly to be hoped will never become necessary. If, however, as it is to be inferred from the policy adopted by some of her guides, a spirit has overleaped the consecrated walls of our Zion, which will not tolerate the inquiry, whether this or that course of conduct is consistent or inconsistent with her law of love—whether her Divine Head, when He commanded that those whom God had joined together, no man should put assunder,

had a mental reservation in favor of the retail dealer in human cattle—whether the universal church, when raising her simultaneous supplication to her “blessed Lord,” that we may hear, **READ**, mark, learn and inwardly digest the Holy Scriptures, requires her members to carry to the throne of grace the exception made in the slavery code, of those who have a drop of African blood in their veins; and the very fact of whose reading their Bibles is proof that a felony has been committed—if a spirit has got into our church which takes offence at the bare inquiry whether such are her doctrines, and which padlocks the lips of her clergy, in expounding the Scriptures to the people on this point, then I, for one, say we are shamefully late in drawing the line between high church and low church—we are disgracefully tardy in striking for a high church party, and pledging every member of it, in a perpetual covenant, to go to the stake, rather than surrender his gospel liberty or his catholic faith. It is often said, and with too much truth, of Episcopalians, that the best of us fall far short of exhibiting in our lives, the beauty of our truly high church principles; but the worst of us, I trust, would be disgraced, in reducing his practical morality down to that low and debasing churchmanship, sought to be inflicted upon Episcopacy by the votaries of a peculiar institution. Were we a sectarian church, pledged to a distinctive and peculiar creed, our consciences might feel the hamper, and our minds be embarrassed with the question, how much gospel liberty should be sacrificed at the shrine of sectarian faith; but when we worship a God “whose service is perfect freedom”—when our only conservative principle is evangelic faith and apostolic order, with unrestricted gospel liberty, for each one to determine for himself, aided by the kindly teachings of the church, what that faith is, the high functionaries of our church should encourage, rather than suppress an examination of so interesting, so beautiful and so momentous a question as is involved in the existence of American slavery. Many plausible arguments, growing out of the importance of sustaining their confession of faith, might be put into the mouth of such Presbyterians, as smother the great moral principle which their general assembly of divines, with more Christian candor than conservative tact, asserted, when in 1818, they fearlessly denounced slavery as “utterly inconsistent with the laws of God.”

I can appreciate the strong temptations, which induce some of our modern Methodists to apologize for the uncourtly denunciations employed by their Wesley and his primitive followers, against American slavery, when in the scrippless and purseless dignity of apostles, they spread their faith among our backwoodsmen, and shook the dust from their feet, as freely against the rich as the poor, the master as the slave, that received not the

gospel. I can in like manner, invent an argument that would become the mouth of a Baptist, a Congregationalist, or a member of any other branch of the church, while his conscience is alternating between sectarian zeal and elementary morality.—But when we, who claim to be the trunk of the church—who have in our stereotyped liturgy, a pole star, to the rectitude and truth of which, as a gospel expository, clashing sectaries have from age to age concurred in bearing honorable testimony—a church whose only recognized faith is an acknowledged lithograph from the Rock of Ages—a church which looks with equal complacency on the tenets that sunder the followers of Calvin and Luther, and Armenius and Wesley—whose temple gates are opened wide to invite all to hear this faith expounded—which spreads her truly Catholic communion to all, irrespective of wrangling dogmas and catagories—“who do truly and earnestly repent of their sins, and are in love and charity with their neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways.” Such a church can well afford to be single minded in converging her holiest counsels, to enlighten the minds of those whom she thus invites to encircle her altar, on the momentous question, who is our neighbor, and what is love and charity towards him—whether the relation of neighbor is lost, or the law of love suspended by a human statute—whether we ought to feed the hungry and clothe the naked in Ohio, by the same rule as in Pennsylvania—whether, when the scared and trembling victim of slavery comes to us, panting for restoration to denied humanity, and evinces that he is indeed a man and a brother, our heart should recognize any other prompter than the inextinguishable sympathies which the God of Nature has planted there, or our hand submit to the guidance of any other directory than the God of Revelation has emblazoned on the pages of his word. The fear to discuss these, and a thousand other points of moral duty growing out of the slavery code, is a libel on our church. If her virgin gold is indeed so basely alloyed, as to render such a discussion dangerous to her unity, let her be broken up. A pitcher so frangible, is as unfit for use as a broken pitcher, and much more deceptive.

I suppose one of the great advantages of Episcopacy to be, that she has less occasion to perplex herself about her conservatism than other associations, that we are all orthodox so long as we are Christians, and that though the church is our instructor in some few points respecting her own organization, she never excommunicates for a diversity of opinion, even in this matter. She never assumes the authority of a lawgiver, on any controverted point of Christian doctrine, but draws the mind and conscience of her members by persuasion, counsel and argument,

in the wisdom and purity of which, her conservative strength is concealed.

But whether I am right or not in my views of the church, or of her gospel, I am prepared to be still more ultra on the anti-slavery question. In yielding a single hearted devotion to the God of truth, as he has revealed himself to my mind, I must cast behind me a pro-slavery Christianity. I see much in the works, as well as the word of God, which transcends the limited comprehension of my feeble mind, and which reminds me of the infantile state of my rational functions, and the consequent propriety of cultivating a childlike meekness, and docility of spirit, in learning the wondrous things of God's law. But all the energies of my embryo mind, every attribute of my infant soul, is instinct with holy warfare against a God, who declares to me in His revealed will, that I can enslave, or be enslaved, without violating His laws. It is engraven on my heart, it is stereotyped on my soul, that such a God is not the author of my being, and that consequently I owe Him no homage. I cannot crucify common sense, I cannot abjure axiomatic truth for the sake of defending a slavery approving Bible. I take sides on this question, with those who signed the Declaration of Independence. But who would have thought at that day, that by doing so, I am taking sides with the infidel, against the doctrine of Christ? Who would have then thought, that the Tom Paine's of that day, destitute as they were, of ammunition to assail the religion of Jesus, would so soon have the work accomplished to their hand, by a misguided ministry, the necessary consequence of whose doctrines is to stab her under the fifth rib, between the porch and the altar of her own sanctuary. I hope and believe that the number of those clergy who fall under this condemnation, is yet limited, but I am not to be deterred from taking this high stand, though sixteen mitred prelates, with their nine hundred and thirty-one consecrated priests, should all come out in canonical array, raise the ecclesiastical sneer, point the finger of clerical reproach, and unite in the war-cry of FANATIC, against me. My moral and physical perceptions all tell me, that there is more of this fanaticism in heaven and earth than flickers in my poor empty bosom—that it is but a part of that congenial flame which pervades mind and matter, sense and substance, and by which all things created impart to each other the conscious truth, that they are the handy work of a liberty-loving, a slave-abominating God; and although a somewhat "*exciting subject*," to every susceptible nature, this so much deprecated fanaticism is not pent up or smothered down, by a Lynch club of commissioned archangels, or a theological gag, invented by nature's high priest; but the passing breeze is allowed to whisper it to the listening grove—the wrathful tornado is licensed to proclaim it to the

tending oak—the majestic ocean wave bears it in solemn pomp to the distant shore—the incendiary stars connive with each other through their twinkling rays, and dart the tidings from cycle to epicycle, from system to system, from centre to circumference, of nature's universal realm. Every element is telegraphic of the intelligence—every sentient being is "*fanaticised*" with the exciting theme. Nor has man escaped the contagion. Prone as is his abject and dilapidated nature to invent an inferior deity, that will mirror forth his broken perfections, and prototype his present apostacy, when did he ever, in his extreme debasement, worship a pro-slavery God? The iron-hearted Roman had a god of war, and the ferocious Vandal a god of vengeance, but range the Pagan world,

"From Greenland's icy mountains
"To India's coral strand,"

and where will the hill be found, that ever reeked with incense, burnt to a slavery loving divinity? When did the Nine sisters hold dalliance with the demon of slavery? When was Apollo's lyre strung to his praise? When did the wild harp of northern minstrelsy, in its long buried melodies, indite a hymn to the dark vampyre? When did the debased Hottentot—when did the "*inferior race*" that people the coast of Africa, bend their benighted souls to such a god? Never till the Christian coffee was forged—never till the evangelical thumb-screw was invented—never till his flesh had hissed beneath the initializing brand of gospel chattelship—never till his blood and sinews had tasted the glad tidings and good will to men, measured out by the cord of patriarchal affection—a cord, which, as my friend Staunton describes it, is seven feet long, with a silken twist at one end, and a loaded stock at the other. It was then, that his broken heart and mangled spirit essayed to sing the new song, set to gospel music, and to chaunt a forced hallelujah to a slavery-approving God.

MUTILATIONS OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY.

In the view of slavery taken in the foregoing chapter, I am quite sensible that the inferences there drawn, will be as revolting to the feelings of all who call themselves Christians, as they are irrefutable to the minds of all who fancy themselves independent thinkers. Justice to the many honest hearts apologizing for slavery, forbids that their heads, however hoary with experience, however sage of repute in political or ecclesiastical council, should any longer be regarded as an implicit directory to the Temple of Celestial Wisdom. If we compare creeds, it will be found that there is at least one point on which there is perfect unanimity. We are all opposed to the catholicism of slavery, or the indiscriminate and reciprocal application of its principle. Some few of us, on this side of Mason and Dixon's line, may have embraced southern orthodoxy, as taught by Professor Dew, that African slavery is not only the sheet anchor of our liberty, but the handmaid of our religion. The most of us, however, will agree in condemning even African slavery in the abstract. Thus far we are tolerably harmonious. But when we begin to analyze slavery *as it is*, with a view of delineating its moral character and enquiring what are the duties of the church respecting it, then it is that the subtlety of human jesuitism is seen oozing out of every pore of the conscience; then it is that arrogance knits its brows into a frown, and the errors and infirmities of the great are aped, till each one vauntingly says,

"I cough like Horace; and though lean, am short."

The sanctity of public prejudice is invoked, and even the less pious demonstrations of a brickbat are not despised arguments, when thrown from the castle of conservative power, against radical truth.. Some say, that inasmuch as slavery is a political evil, it is for the statesman, and not the clergyman to see it.—Others pry into the politics of the Almighty, and with all the sapientcy of a member of His privy council, pronounce slavery a curse, dispensed to this nation, which He will remove in His own good time, and that we must not distract the mysterious councils of Heaven, by a rash interference with it. Many derive much pious comfort in the speculation that Christianity will do, by indirection, what it would be wrong to do directly, in the way of destroying slavery, and that it will ultimately "die of a rose in aromatic pain." But the cataplasm which has the most soothing influence on the public conscience, is found in the time

honored dogma, that religion should never interfere, directly, with the law making power, but that its office is to enjoin loyalty to Cæsar, and not frustrate his councils. In the foregoing review, I had occasion to touch incidentally the fallacy of this position. Subsequent reflection induces me to trace out its genealogy and history, not so much for the sake of vindicating my anti-slavery principles, as of calling the attention of that portion of the Christian public, who love the God of TRUTH more than the god of PUBLIC OPINION, to a heresy of unspeakable magnitude. In opposing this dogma, I am aware that I am opposing the established usages of all nations, Christian and heathen, in all ages of the world. I am, however, equally aware, that I am also opposing all the jesuitism, nine tenths of the practical infidelity, and probably as large a fraction of the hypocrisy with which the religion of Jesus has been strangling these fifteen hundred years past. The subject is one whose importance claims a hundred fold more time, and a thousand fold more space, than I can at present afford it. All I propose doing, is to sketch, and that but rudely, a few of its outlines, just enough to provoke an abler and more leisurely pen, aided by a minuter acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, and enriched with a deeper perception of Bible truth, to complete the picture.

From the year 98, in the reign of Trajan, to that of Constantine, there was a standing Imperial edict, authorising capital punishment to be inflicted on every subject of the Roman Empire, who would not renounce Christianity. On the death of Constantius Chlorus, his son Constantine was in the year 306, chosen Emperor, by the soldiery. With this color of title to the crown, which was undoubtedly the most available that the distracted state of the dilapidating empire could confer, he marched into the western provinces, and took possession of Gaul, Spain and Britain. He then overcame the Franks, made prisoners of two of their leaders, followed them over the Rhine, and there surprised and defeated them in signal triumph. He then directed his arms against his competitor Maxentius, and while in this campaign, he represents that he saw a flaming cross in the heavens, beneath the sun, bearing the inscription, "*In hoc signo vinces*," (under this sign thou shalt conquer.) In the following night, he says Christ appeared to him, and commanded him to take for his standard an imitation of the fiery cross he had seen in the heavens. He accordingly caused such a standard to be constructed, which he called the *Labarum*, under which, a few days afterwards, (Oct. 27th, 312,) he vanquished the army of Maxentius, under the walls of Rome, and drove it into the Tiber. He then entered the city in triumph, and received as a reward for his pious valor, from the Roman Senate, the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, or chief pontiff, or priest of the Pagan hierarchy. The

next year, (313,) he publishes the memorable edict, giving equal toleration to Christian and Pagan worship throughout the Roman Empire, and restoring to the Christians all the property which had been taken from them and confiscated. He also ordained some other very humane edicts, among which was one prohibiting the separation of the domestic relations, on the sale of slaves. He and his son-in-law Licinius, who was another of his competitors, carried on a continued war against each other, the one surrounded by his bishops and the Christians under the *labarum*, and the other by his magicians and soothsayers, under the Pagan standard, till 325, when Constantine's forces prevailed, and he became the sole and undisputed head of the Eastern and Western Empire. He then attended the celebrated Council of Nice, and occupied the golden chair, while the great question of Christian orthodoxy between the Trinitarians and the Arians, was under discussion; and though he sided with the Trinitarians in that controversy, yet he was baptized by an Arian priest, during his last illness and just before his death, in 337.

Up to the time of this rally under the *labarum*, I have been unable to find an authentic account of Christians resorting to physical coercion, or approvingly recognizing war, in any emergency. The circumstance of their bishops, clergy and laity, joining the standard of Constantine with so little hesitancy, in connection with the fact that the Christianized Pagans were, and always had been, very superstitious in their belief of miraculous signs and wonders, is certainly very strong evidence of their being honestly duped by the military chieftain into the belief that a genuine revelation had been made to him from heaven, and that the *labarum*, constructed in pursuance thereof, was indeed, a consecrated standard, under which it was the duty of Christians to array themselves in military warfare. Eusebius, himself, the father of ecclesiastical history, speaks of the *labarum*, and many other miraculous occurrences, in his day, and in the previous history of the church, with apparent approbation and credence.

Christianity had passed through the fire of ten successive persecutions, beginning with the persecution in the year 98, when John, the last surviving apostle, closed the volume of Revelation by writing the Apocalypse, and ending with the ascension of Constantine to the throne of the Roman Empire. During this period, her faithful votaries were crucified, beheaded, thrown into the amphitheatre of wild beasts, and tortured in every variety of mode, which Roman ingenuity could invent, with a view of exterminating what the learned and astute Tacitus pronounced an execrable or pernicious superstition. Pernicious it assuredly was to the religious institutions which the wisdom and patriot-

ism and philosophy of Rome had been fostering and aggrandizing for ages; but its essence was inextinguishable, and its progress onward. This Constantine had the sagacity to see, and amid the distractions which then reigned in the Roman Empire, he consulted his ambition, and mounted Christianity as a political hobby. Who that understands the benignant character of our religion, and the deep laid schemes of political ambition, does not perceive in the words "*in hoc signo vinces*," which he pretends greeted his ear, the whisperings of the oracle of military adventure, rather than the voice of the Prince of Peace? The trick, in this less superstitious, and more crafty age of the world, must be obvious to every mind; and the Roman Senate heaved more good sense and adherence to their orthodoxy, in consecrating him *Pontifex Maximus*, than did Athanasius and Eusebius and their brother bishops, at the Council of Nice, in admitting him to help settle a principle of Christian faith, or their successors, in subsequently canonizing him as a saint. This was the first monarch that ever approvingly recognized our religion, and from that day to this, (with the exception of Julian the apostate,) I am not aware of a potentate in Christendom, that has not been clothed, in some form, with ecclesiastical honors and authority, given in barter by the church, for political protection and secular patronage.

Eusebius, the historian of the church up to this time, very naturally gives vent to his gratitude to God, and his praises of Constantine, when he contrasts the clemency and tolerance of that monarch, with the bitter and unrelenting persecutions which Christianity had suffered, from the time that her Author was nailed to the cross, at Jerusalem, to the time when she ascended the throne of the Cæsars, in the person of his beloved sovereign. But it does not appear to have occurred to that bishop, or his cotemporaries, or to their successors in office, that the religion of Christ was not designed by its Author as a substitute for Paganism, in dancing attendance at the courts of an earthly potentate, and yet the result of evangelizing the Roman Empire, was to place Christianity under the wing of political power, and have it move in the same secondary orbit round the throne of Cæsar, which Paganism had previously occupied. It does not seem to have occurred to the Christians of that day, that their religion and Paganism were as different in their claims and pretensions as they are in their rites and requirements.—The one was evidently an invented religion, the creature of public opinion, plastic and accommodating in its theory, and self-adjusting to the spirit of the times, and was consequently a useful engine of state power, and properly controlled by the wisdom of the Roman Senate: the other claimed to be a revelation from the fountain of Infinite Wisdom, predicated on the blindness and

folly of worldly expediency, and was consequently inflexible in its requirements of implicit obedience, and unaccommodating in its principles. The subsequent history of the church, from that day to this, shews that the one of these religions slid into the same niche previously occupied by the other. If there be any difference in point of loyalty to Cæsar, or obsequiousness to his nod, it is in the more dapper and pliant spirit with which Christianity not only truckles to political iniquity, but lends it her mantle, and baptizes its ministers with her titles of "Defender of the Faith," "Most Christian Majesty," &c.

Happy, thrice happy would it have been for our race, if the pliable and credulous Eusebius, and his duped cotemporaries, had, at this most critical epoch in the history of Christianity, given their minds to the science of moral influence, as revealed in their religion, and so strikingly illustrated in its history, instead of lending so easy an ear to the inventions of a designing politician. They would have seen that there is a law, ancient as God's throne, and co-extensive with the supremacy of His sceptre, by which it is decreed that error, though clad in triple steel, must fall before the omnipotence of truth, and that the birthright of virtue is a sceptre of dominion over vice. They would have seen that in the politics of heaven, truth is a unit, and that harmony reigns in her empire, whether in heaven or on earth, while error is manifold and multiform, and the demon of distraction is decreed to be her privy counsellor. If they had but understood the tactics of the GREAT MAGICIAN, who makes diviners mad, when He vested all power in a little party, then composed of eleven illiterate fishermen, they would never have mingled councils with an earthly prince, however potent. They would indeed have rejoiced, they would have thanked God and taken courage, when they saw that the righteous work was going forward, in defiance of the powers and principalities of earth, to such an extent that political ambition was already beginning to discover the expediency of paying its destined knee-tribute. They would have blessed heaven for the breeze, instead of cringing to the weathercock that was turned by it. Instead of rallying under the *labarum* of a military chieftain, they would have clung yet more tenaciously to the *true cross*, and as faithful soldiers, fighting under the Great Captain of their salvation, would have despised those carnal weapons which he rejected in establishing a kingdom not of this world.

Never, since Adam substituted the counsels of expediency, taught him by the wily serpent, for the commands of his God, was so lamentable an error committed. Ten times had Christian truth passed through the fire of political persecution, and ten times had it come out purified of earthly dross—the hotter the furnace the brighter the gold. Christianity waxed mightier

and mightier, till just as she was achieving her triumphs over the principalities and powers of darkness, in an evil hour, she took counsel in the school of human expediency, and mingled earthly with celestial wisdom. From that day to this, her silver has become dross ; her wine mixed with water. Her faithful votaries had, under the example of her Founder and His apostles, been well trained, by nearly three hundred years experience, to endure persecution ; but the time had now arrived, when a new lesson was to be learned, in which they had abundant precept, but no canonical example to guide them. In the school of adversity, they grew strong and wise, but they made shipwreck on the shoals of worldly prosperity. They could endure the cross, the gibbet, the stake and the rack ; but the smiles of princes, the pageantry of courts, the pomps and vanities of worldly power, and the fascinations of political influence, allured them to deviate from the hitherto thorny path of virtue. For three hundred years, Christianity was a mighty champion in fighting the good fight of faith. He slew his thousands and his tens of thousands, his millions and his tens of millions, till his awe-stricken foes quailed and looked aghast, wondering within themselves, where his great strength lay ; but the Delilah of human expediency enticed him, and while dreaming of earthly bliss, and unmindful of his consecration vows, the Nazarene permitted the razor to come upon his head, and his seven locks to be shaven. From that day to this, he has been grinding in the prison house of Philistine servitude. From that day to this, he has been the sport of the worshippers of a political Dagon.

The subsequent history of the church is soon told, and might easily have been foreseen. In every department of action, her grand and distinctive maxim was inverted—expediency became the standard of principle, instead of principle being the standard of expediency. Her integrity broken, and the maxims of human utility substituted for the chaste severity of her radical faith, her gradual descent into the sink of pollution, in which she wallowed for the next twelve centuries, followed by as natural a sequence, as does the degradation, and ultimate loathsomeness, of the incautious female, on her first swerving from the path of virtue.

It is generally supposed that the Protestant Reformation restored the church to its pristine integrity. This, to my mind, is an error as egregious as it is popular, among Protestants.—Luther and Calvin, Melancthon and Zuinglius, Wickliffe and Knox, and their worthy compeers, did much in stemming the tide of jesuitism, and correcting the abuses of a corrupted Christianity, but they also left much undone. They cut up by the roots different classes of errors, some of which sprung from aboriginal Paganism, some from a secularized Christianity, and

some from that mongrel state of public sentiment proceeding from a coalition of the two religions. Among the *first*, and least abnoxious of these tribes, may be reckoned image worship, invocation of saints and angels, the sanctity of relics, and the canonization of saints. In the *second*, and most formidable tribe, may be classed the infallibility of the Pope, sale of indulgencies, auricular confession, pardoning of sins, the invention of a purgatory, and enjoining the ignorance of the laity. The *third* class embraces that heterogeneous family, growing out of the superstition of the former, and the fanaticism of the latter, such as penance, monastic seclusion, supererogation, keeping no faith with heretics, propagating religion with the sword, preserving ecclesiastical conservatism by papal bulls, &c.

In lopping off these, and kindred errors, both in faith and practice, the Protestant reformers did much. Their labors were Herculean, their courage and fortitude heroic, and their meed of renown deservedly imperishable. But while we revere their undying names, we cannot be too careful of sliding into that error, which they so nobly shunned, and to which mankind, in all ages, have ever been lamentably prone—that of picturing to our imagination a *beau ideal* of perfection in the great and good men with which the world has from time to time been favored. The Grecians had a Hercules, the Chinese a Confucius, the Persians a Zoroaster, the English an Alfred, and the Americans a Washington, who have, by the overweening veneration of succeeding ages, been more or less the objects of an idolatrous admiration. It is to this foible of our fallen nature, that the heroes of Pagan antiquity are indebted for their apotheosis, and the saints of Catholic christendom for their canonization. In the same spirit of man-worship, Protestants have put on the livery of moral and intellectual servitude, and have been proud to demean themselves with the idolatrous epithet of Calvinist, Lutheran, &c., by substituting, as a platform, the opinions of these illustrious, but fallible champions of the reformation, for the rock of truth. If the spirits of the great and good, that have departed this life, were permitted to mingle with their earthly admirers, how emphatically would they say to us, as Parnell's angel did to his pious hermit,

“Nay, cease to kneel—thy fellow servant I!”

How severely would the mighty shade of Bacon rebuke those Christians who substitute the heathen and brute *ipse dixit* of the peripatetic school, for the heaven-descended, the inductive philosophy which he analyzed! It may seem to us that the Holy Spirit employed too severe an epithet, when He called those early Christians “*carnal*,” for merely saying one to another, “I am of Paul, and I of Apollos,” and thereby substituting His own highly honored amanuensis for a model, instead of the one only

perfect ensample ; but we should never forget the awful accompaniments of the following declaration from Mount Sinai, nor the place assigned it on the two tables of stone, "*I am the Lord thy God: Thou shalt have none other gods but me.*" It is in a spirit of simple minded obedience to this solemn behest, mingled with a filial regard for the noble example set me by the master spirits of the Reformation, that I propose to employ the weapons, they taught me to use, in canvassing their works and in calling the attention of their followers to one of their unfinished, or rather misguided labors ; and with as much courtesy, at least, as is conceived to be due from conscious truth to consecrated error, I propose to invade the time hallowed courts of Protestant Christianity.

In renouncing the errors of Romanism, the ecclesiastical power exercised by the Pope as the supreme head of the then undivided western church, instead of being abrogated or vested in the reformed churches, through their Bishops, their Presbyters, or their congregational authorities, was cantoned out to the territorial sovereign, in his political capacity. This, instead of being a reformation, was in reality, a sacrilege. It might be, and undoubtedly was, highly inexpedient to clothe any one functionary of the church with so much power as the papal see had, by political devices, concentrated in his own hands ; but it was an utter perversion of principle, and a profane desecration, to attach any portion of this power to a secular crown. Such, however, was the uniform practise throughout Protestant christendom. In England, the struggle for supreme ecclesiastical power, took place under the reign of Henry the eighth. Shortly after that ruthless tyrant had written a controversial treatise against Protestantism, and had been rewarded by the Pope for this service, with the title of "*Defender of the Faith,*" he took it into his head that the papal provisions and powers, so far as England was concerned, might as well be appropriated to himself. The contest between him and the Pope, on this point, was long and severe. The weapons employed, were papal bulls on one side, and penal statutes of *præmunire* on the other. At length the moral influence of the Protestant faith, combined with the vaulting ambition of the English tyrant, prevailed. From that day to this, the supreme ecclesiastical power of the church has been a prerogative of the English crown, and the title of Defender of the Faith, earned by Henry the eighth, in writing down Protestantism, has been inherited by his Protestant successors, and is now considered a reward of their labors in building it up.

There are three distinct theories resorted to, on which supreme ecclesiastical power is claimed by, and yielded to, the Protestant sovereigns of Europe. One is the *Episcopal* system, so called, according to which this power was transferred from the Tiara to the secular crown by the Reformation, a specimen of which

is seen in England. A second is the *territorial* system, founded on the principle that the worldly ruler is by virtue of his office, the head of the church in his own dominions. This is the *Pagan* theory, and is evidently borrowed from their usages. The third is the *collegial* system, which assumes that the members of a church are a society whose rights rest upon a contract, whereby it is supposed that a part of those rights are conferred by the sovereign. All are equally unscriptural, and repugnant to the genius of a religion which claims to be revealed from heaven, and which jealously exacts of its votaries the supreme and entire devotion of the heart and life.

The Reformers have given us a very pure code of moral ethics between man and man, in the Christian religion, but they have made us pay for it very dearly in requiring us to obey Cæsar rather than God, in the case of a political emergency. They have taught us that Christianity, as between subject and subject, is a perfect and holy law; but that as between potentate and potentate, it is a mere tail piece to balance the kite of political power—that the altar of the church is indeed holy to the people, but to the prince it is a mere footstool to the throne. In this double character, our religion is held up to the world. In the assaults which it receives from those whom it denounces as free thinkers, it is not always easy to determine whether the derider or the derided are most in fault.

After wallowing in the mire of ecclesiastical corruption, and strangling in the meshes of political intrigue since the days of Constantine, it would be natural enough to indulge the fond hope that Christianity had at length found an asylum in the New World—that this child of the skies, after panting so long for deliverance from the cruel nurture of an earthly foster-mother, would breathe a congenial atmosphere in a clime redolent with liberty. The new theory of the right and power of a people to govern themselves, had many points of coincidence and congeniality, and none of collision, with her elementary truths. The doctrine of the essential equality of man was already hers. The great democratic principle that God is no respecter of persons, was a cardinal article of her ancient faith. The doctrine that God had made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, paved the way for a republican form of government, by reducing to a political fiction the divine right of kings, and the hereditary aristocracy of a titled nobility. The Christian and the American citizen are alike taught to call no man master. The organic laws of our free institutions recognize, for the first time in the history of our race, the supremacy of God's laws over human legislation, when they granted the elementary and unalienable right of worshipping God with that freedom and independence which the supreme and unbribed de-

rotation of the heart requires, without fear or censure from political power. Our clergy, too, instead of leaning on the corrupting patronage of an earthly potentate, are taught to preach the almost obsolete doctrine that the laborer is worthy of his hire.—For the first time on earth, was Christianity allowed to assert her jurisdiction over the whole empire of moral evil, in high places as well as in low, and her ministers licensed to proclaim the whole counsels of God, as freely to the lawgiver as to the subject, to the judge as to the culprit, and to teach the great, but ill-remembered truth, that virtue exalteth a nation. The throne of political power had heretofore been a sanctuary for sin, and the ambassador of Christ, instead of standing forth in the grandeur and moral dignity of a representative of the King of Kings, had been trained in the school of a dastard expediency, to mingle with the meanest sycophants of a mercenary court. Instead of rebuking political transgression with that pungent severity employed by Nathan to the King of Israel, he threw the mantle of clerical influence over the sins of royalty, and taught an insulted and too credulous laity to call him "*Most Christian Majesty*."

The unspeakable advantages, resulting from the divorcement of church and state, have never been appreciated by the American church. Christianity has so long truckled to political power, that her ancient gospel claims seem to have been lost by prescription. She has been so long employed to work the engine of state, that an opinion has grown venerable with age, and pious for uniform sanctity, that it is a part of her vocation, and that she must at all events, harmonize herself with the powers that be—that a spirit of concession must be cultivated, which seems to be considered as interesting a virtue between church and state, as between husband and wife. Now Christianity, instead of being so very meek and amiable a yokefellow in the conjugal relation, is exactly the reverse. She is at war with every thing that is inconsistent with the perfect law of truth and holiness. She does not, indeed, interfere with the schemes of worldly wisdom, when employed about worldly matters, either public or private, individual or political, till a question touching the exposition of God's law is agitated, the righteousness of a proposed act is to be decided, or the removal of a moral evil is to be effected. She then claims to be the sole oracle. She refuses to mingle counsels with statesmen, or to sit in caucus with worldly wisecrackers, to discuss the question, when is the most convenient season to renounce sin, nor will she listen to an argument to prove the expediency of gradualism over immediatism in the removal of moral evil; but she at once draws the two edged sword of gospel truth, and severs at a blow, the gordian knot of a complicated iniquity. She assails moral evil, in season and out of season, directly and indirectly, collaterally and bilaterally, im-

mediately and uncompromisingly. Nor does she respect those technical limits of human responsibility which President Wayland has invented, by checking her thunders in mid-volley, for fear that the designs of a political blackleg may be defeated, or the popularity of a corrupt administration scathed. But the higher iniquity vaults, and the more towering its political ramparts, the fiercer are her thunders. She will not, indeed, break the bruised reed, but in the kindest accents of mercy, she whispers to the penitent, thrust down to the lower walks of life, by an ignominious transgression, "*Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more.*" But when those who sit in Moses' seat are arraigned—when the philactery of official rank is enlarged to cover iniquity—when the blind leader of the blind is detected—when widow's houses are devoured, or grievous burdens are bound on men's shoulders—when mint, and anise, and cummin are tithed, as a substitute for omitted judgment, mercy and faith—when political and ecclesiastical power is perverted, till it resembles a whited sepulchre—when the tombs of the prophets are built up, or the sepulchres of the righteous garnished, as a stroke of conservative policy, by the incumbents of power, she does not pause to enquire whether a corrupt administration is worse than none, whether the net work of political chicanery is not profitable, as an engine of secular power, till something better can be substituted; but she at once girds herself with omnipotence, her right arm waxes red with wrath, her bolts of vengeance are sped, and the deep damnation of her woes are poured forth upon the popularity-seeking scribe, the jesuitical Pharisee, and the well masked hypocrite, and notwithstanding the high places they disgrace, the greetings they receive in the market, and the uppermost rooms at feasts, or the chief seats in the synagogues, that public opinion may assign them; notwithstanding they are called of men Rabbi; she tramples all their dignities beneath her feet, and with withering contempt, says to them, "*Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers! how can ye escape the damnation of hell?*"

It is often said, that a man born and bred in slavery, requires preparatory training to enable him to enjoy liberty. I fear it will require a much longer time to prepare the American church, to resume the full exercise of that liberty wherewith Christ has made her free, and of which she has been so long bereft. Her Founder granted, and our constitution has ratified the grant, that she shall hold the helm of moral power to guide this nation, so far as to keep her legislative, executive and judicial councils within the line of obedience to God's law, but no farther. It is for the pulpits to expound and construe the original compact between God and this nation, and if a statute be passed by our legislatures, colliding with such compact, it is for the clergy to

proclaim it a nullity from the pulpits, and to teach men to trample upon it as such, and direct the adoption of such political action as the emergency of the occasion may require, to bring the sovereign power of those who fear God, to be felt in the most effectual manner, in having the statute expunged from the archives of our country. Feeble as may be the influence of Christian ethics on public opinion, it has always been abundantly able, if exerted, to frustrate the councils of the most popular iniquity. None would quail sooner at the array of moral influence, than the crafty and unprincipled politician, none would be more terror-stricken at seeing her hand-writing on the wall.

But to say nothing of our slavery laws, how many citizens are there who profess to believe the bible, and to recognize the orthodoxy of its ethical principles, that are honestly of opinion that the war now waging against the poor Seminole Indians, does not meet the approbation of the Prince of Peace? Probably as many as ninety-nine in a hundred of both clergy and laymen.—And yet, however the different denominations of our clergy may disagree on other points, they all agree in letting this sin go unrebuked. The same jesuitism which guides the councils of European potentates, and is there restricted to a narrow and exclusive circle of courtiers and placemen, is here diffused and sown broad-cast, among the mass of the people. It is, in fact, worse here than there. At a European court, vice is gilded and iniquity refined; but here, the very idea of the ballot box, now brings with it, to the moral olfactories of every conscientious man, “the rankest compound of villanous smells.” Politics are growing more and more of a farce, and the few remaining Christians who preserve their political consistency by following their party “through evil and through good report,” as it is profanely termed, almost giggle in their sleeves, across the communion table, at the devices, the intrigues and the false pretences practised on each other, through the organ presses and otherwise, to gull the honest and simple minded voter. And not unfrequently, the influence which church membership confers, pays its party tax for this purpose, under the belief that all is fair in politics, while the good man in the pulpit observes a knowing silence, and prudently avoids touching the “*exciting subject*,” from a fear that he may accidentally commit the unpardonable sin of jostling a party organization, which he well knows to be corrupt to the core.

It is often asked why the missionary labors, which have been so zealously extended, these fifty years past, do not meet with the same success with which those of the immediate successors of the apostles were crowned. We protestants agree that the age of miracles had then ceased, and that Christianity, as a system of moral truth, was left in the hands of its appointed minis-

ters and votaries, to find its way into the hearts and understandings of the Pagan world with no other than the natural agencies and apparatus which our missionaries now enjoy.— Besides these, the modern missionary has the advantage of the arts and sciences of civilized life, which are all confessedly, in a greater or less degree, the handmaids of gospel truth. The present missionaries have also the innumerable facilities resulting from the art of printing, in multiplying Bibles and expositories of Bibles and elementary works for the young and unenlightened. They have also, we doubt not, as much evangelical zeal and honest devotion in carrying forward the great enterprise. Doctor Paley, in his *Evidences of Christianity*, shews very conclusively, on a minute and circumstantial comparison, that the modern missionary has decidedly superior advantages to the primitive. Why, therefore, such a lamentable contrast in the result of their labors? Mr. Paley answers this question by saying that “they possessed means of conviction which we have not; that they had proofs to appeal to which we want.” I think a much better one might be given. We have all the external proofs necessary to combat the most ingenious infidelity, as he has himself shewn, and as the history of the last half century has abundantly evinced, without opening the Bible; besides our means of conviction and proofs, so far as relates to external evidence, are the last branch of the subject that we look into ourselves and were probably as little attended to by the illiterate heathen in that day as in this. It is the internal evidence, the moral beauty of our religion, and its truth to nature, that convinced and converted the illiterate Roman mind. Like their apostolic predecessors, they spoke not with the enticing words of men’s wisdom, but with the demonstrations of the spirit. My answer to the question would be, that modern Christianity presents in its fruits a different aspect to the heathen world, and has a different moral character from the ancient; that if it could by changing its name, (as political parties sometimes do,) get rid of its present character, it would be an excellent stroke of evangelizing policy. Tacitus, and his contemporary Suetonius, spoke of it as an execrable superstition, but that is no worse a character than abolitionism now receives from the Tacitus and Suetonius of this day, who are as ignorant of its character, and whose denunciations have just about the same measure and kind of influence in checking its progress. But modern Christianity has a long catalogue of giant sins to repent of. For three hundred years past, she has been gnawing like a vulture on the vitals of Africa, and tearing from her bosom her sons and her daughters, to supply the Christian slave markets. Since she first rallied under the *labarum* of Constantine, she has waged near two hundred wars, many of which were for conquest and the acquisition

of territory, some to arrive at a more logical construction of treaties, and some to settle the question who should be the defenders of her faith, by succession to the crown. According to the best statistics that we have, Christendom, with a population of little more than 200,000,000, maintains, even in time of peace, a *physical force* of from three to four millions of soldiers, or about one soldier to every seventy souls, while *moral suasion* is so far advanced in the Celestial Empire of China, that with a population of 361,000,000, she has only 80,000 regular soldiers, besides 700,000 militia or citizen soldiers, being one soldier to every 4512, or including the militia, one to every 463 inhabitants.

The sword of Christian ferocity is only whetted by her advances in the arts and sciences of what she calls civilized life, and Great Britain, who gives religion, and philosophy, and laws, and literature, and language, to the greater portion of what is deemed the enlightened world, grins like a mastiff, eager for the carnage, and the signal to cry "havoc, and let slip the dogs of war." Her lion and her unicorn are always rampant. She saith among the trumpets, ha! ha! and smelleth the battle afar off. Her defenders of the faith, from Henry the eighth to Victoria the first, have been swift to execute the commission, "*arise and devour much flesh.*" Her war establishment and her church establishment are twin sisters. They have grown up in each other's bosom, and fattened on the nation's strength, till they have become prodigies in the eyes of a wondering world. Her sovereigns, in coalition with her other church dignitaries, have profaned her otherwise Divine liturgy, with a tissue of state prayers, teaching her people, among other invocations, to pray that God may strengthen her king, "that he may vanquish and overcome all his enemies;" a petition more properly addressed to Woden than to the Prince of Peace, and which, fortunately for my orthodoxy, was expunged from the American liturgy. When the Pagan sees Christ arrayed against Christ, and cross against cross, as on the field of Waterloo, what opinion can he form of the gospel of peace? When he casts his eye along the bloody trail of the Russian campaign, and sees the "ocean of flame" bursting from the city of Moscow, what definition does it give him of the tender mercies of Christianity? It is in vain for us to presume on the ignorance of the heathen world of the national sins of Christians. The wailings of bleeding Africa have been borne on the trade winds to the ends of the earth. The sympathies of man for man, unfortunately for our religion, course up and down, and circumnavigate the great circle of humanity.—The myriads of Christian swords and bayonets that have been baptized in blood, the legions that have been slaughtered in the name of Christ are not unknown to Pagan tradition.

Our missionaries may go to heathen lands, and there be per-

mitted to proclaim, what they dare not do at home, that such acts, though done in the name of "most Christian" kings, are in fact not in accordance with the genius of the gospel. With such a *Waylandism*, Christians may be gulled, but the less sophisticated heathen mind cannot understand that mystery of our faith which identifies moral evil with political righteousness, and reconciles the national law of war and oppression with the moral law of brotherly love. Before opening the gospel, he unfortunately understands too well how to judge the tree by its fruits, and that figs are not gathered of thorns, or grapes of thistles.

Hear the reason assigned by the Chinese Emperor for refusing to admit Christianity into his empire: "Because," said the Emperor, "wherever Christians go, they whiten the soil with human bones." "Why do you come to us?" said a Turk, at the city of Jerusalem to Mr. Wolf, the missionary who lately visited this country. The missionary answered, "to bring you the gospel of peace." "Peace!" replied the Turk, leading Mr. Wolf to a window, and pointing him to Mount Calvary, "there," said he, "on that very spot where your Lord poured out his blood, the Mohammedan is obliged to interfere to prevent Christians shedding the blood of each other."

Modern Christianity may put on her smooth face, and tell the world how much she has mitigated the horrors of war. She may boast that she no longer supplies her slave markets from prisoners taken in battle, but that she resorts to the more benignant practice of rearing, or, (to speak more technically,) "*growing*" them in her own folds. She may lead us through her arsenals, and shew us that the poisoned arrow is not there. She may boast the beauty of her gunpowder missionaries, over the heathen javelin, sent to deal death to the distant victim, in the shape of balls, bombs and shells. Against these and a few other vaunted ameliorations on which she plumes herself, pitiful as they are, Paganism has an ample set-off to make against American Christianity. Heathen brutality may be challenged, and not a Pagan fiend that ever passed the Styx, dare accept it, of having introduced an engine on the theatre of war, so horrible, or so dastardly, as the unleashed bloodhounds, lately imported, to dispense the clemencies of Christian warfare among the inmates of the Seminole wigwam!

It is generally supposed that it requires a course of mental discipline to elevate the heathen mind, preparatory to its reception of gospel truth. I think that we have much evidence that mental degradation is the soil best adapted to receive the seed of our mongrel religion—that the sinks of fetichism is the good ground that yields its thirty, sixty, and its hundred fold. As a proof of it, we see that the Christian missionary has been much more successful in evangelizing the abject Hottentot than the

high minded American Indian. One would naturally suppose that a soul that soars on so lofty a wing, as does the Aboriginal American, in his bold untutored flights of eloquence, would be admirably adapted to embrace the sublime truths of revelation, as poured forth from the inspired pen of Isaiah and David, or as depicted in the burning words of Jesus Christ, or the apostle of the Gentiles. Far different, however, is the lesson of experience. He unfortunately knew Christians before he understood Christianity. He has, to his sorrow, seen too much of the Christian's political morality; he has witnessed too much of our fraud, our carnage, our slavery, and the international loving kindness and tender mercies of Christian nations towards each other, and towards the human race. He may listen, as he does, with contemplative devoutness of mind, to gospel truth, and admire its beauties, but after deliberate reflection and a careful examination of its fruits on the nation's embracing it, we must not blame him, neither his God nor our God will blame him; if he suspects that the supposed angelic choir, whose voice greeted the ear of the shepherds of Bethlehem, as they were watching their flocks by night, were tantalizing the hopes of poor forlorn humanity, and were indulging in the sports of sardonic irony, and although the Great Spirit, which his mother taught him to adore, may not hold out such big promises—may not boast so high of peace on earth and good will to men, nor enrapture his soul with such good tidings and great joy to all people, yet it whispers to his sober second thoughts, of

"Some safer world, in depth of woods embraced ;
Some happier island in the watery waste,
Where SLAVES once more their native land behold ;
No fiends torment, no CHRISTIANS thirst for gold.

There are three modes by which religion is propagated. One is by educational prejudice, by which I mean the instilling of opinions, whether true or false, into a young or unreflecting mind, by *ipse dixit* authority. The second is, by addressing the interest of the prosolyte. This includes all the appliances, whether coercive or suasive, that are employed to generate a motive to embrace the religion, foreign to the merits of the religion itself. The third is, to assail the mind and soul with such independent and forcible arguments, drawn from the religion itself, as will produce a practical conviction of its truth, irrespective of foreign influences. This last was the only mode which, in the exigency of the times, the early Christians had in their power, and instead of being assisted by the other two, was used in defiance of them, till the days of Constantine. Since then, it has been mainly propagated by the two former modes, and the efforts to propagate it in the primitive mode, have been almost an entire failure. In this remark, I ought, perhaps, to except

the recent success of our missionary labors in the Sandwich Islands, but a glance at the map of the world will show, that success in a spot so peculiarly sequestered and remote from the din of Christian havoc and strife on the two continents, is only illustrative of my theory, and encouraging for our missionaries to search for some other remote "Isles of the sea," in equally blessed ignorance of the political ethics of our religion. But why the general failure? Truth is eternal, and the human mind has the same faculties to receive it in all ages. There must be a more deep rooted and mighty cause for this moral phenomenon than the differences in the flitting and fluctuating superstition of the day with which the Pagan mind may be overcast.—Gospel truth has proved itself to be as omnipotent as mathematical truth, and much more easily instilled into the human mind. Euclid does not have to watch time and tide, or consult the caprices of his pupils in order to find a lodgment of his abstractions in the human mind. If one can chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight, why cannot two hundred millions at once rout Paganism and infidelity from the face of the earth? The solution of this vitally interesting but unheeded mystery, is found in the facts above exhibited, shewing that our religion is alloyed so basely as to have lost its pristine ductility. Nature and nature's God, abhor a mongrel. When the miscreated mule, (the offspring of human fraud on Divine law,) shall sympathise with its forlorn mate, and bring forth after its kind, then may we expect that an oxide of Christianity will flow till it have the heaven given it for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession.

Nor is this all the mischief growing out of the subordination of Christianity to political power. Our religion is not only barren, but she is a self-destructionist. She teaches us to search the Scriptures, to reason together with God, and to worship Him with all our minds; but she also teaches us, through the tradition of her elders, that Cæsar, the great head of the church, can do no wrong—that the confederation of the despots of Europe is a Holy Alliance—that national iniquity becomes sanctified by its own enormity—that while "one murder makes a villain, a thousand makes a hero"—that to pick a pocket, or to rob a house, is an ignominious felony, but if, at the bid of Cæsar, three millions of fellow beings are stolen from themselves, so as to leave them no pocket to pick, no house to rob, our religion teaches us to look on with complacency, and ape Job in pious resignation, by saying, in effect, "Cæsar gave, and Cæsar hath taken away: blessed be the name of Cæsar."

This state of things is too solemn for satire, too grave for irony. The infidel must not be told, as he has often been, by a Janus-faced and double-tongued Christianity, that she is not to

be judged by her fruits—that though she has a practical religion, which is indefensible, she has a theoretical one which is pure and holy. The common law and common sense doctrine of estoppels, is a part of the gospel, and the infidel has a righteous claim to say to her ministry, *out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee*. The rebuked faults of Christians are indeed no part of Christianity, but the doctrines of her ministry, and the tolerated conduct of those whom she clothes with her highest titles, she must defend or surrender her claims to the infidel objector. Christians are greatly deluded if they think that our religion has gained a triumph over that spirit of infidelity which burst out in the French Revolution. Her champions marshalled her historical vouchers, and her external evidences, so as to make assurance doubly sure, of the authenticity of her pretensions, and the genuineness of her claims to a Divine Revelation. The consequence was, that historical infidelity has been thoroughly and signally routed. But in its stead, has sprung up a practical infidelity, which, without being propagated, has within the last fifty years, spontaneously spread itself over the public mind, faster than any religion, true or false, that ever existed. We have no statistics by which to measure its progress, but the candid reader will, I doubt not, in casting his eye over the circle of his acquaintance, agree with me in saying, that those who yield their assent to the authenticity of the Bible, as a Divine Revelation, but do not pretend to embrace it as such, are more numerous than all the open infidels and professing Christians combined. This kind of infidelity was hardly known before Christianity became a political implement. A mere historical faith would never have endured the tests of persecution to which Christianity was exposed before the reign of Constantine, but since then, it has prevailed to an extent, proportioned to the intelligence of the age, and the freedom of the intellect from the shackles of prejudice. Ignorance is as emphatically the mother of devotion in Protestant as in Catholic Christendom. This tenet can never be honestly discarded, till we discard political Christianity. We may invent what new measures we please, we may construct our anxious seats, and continue our protracted meetings—our animal fears may be alarmed, and our nervous sensibilities excited, by all the machinery which honest zeal can invent—our old fashioned churchmanship may vie with our new fangled revivalism—both may boast of their distinctive merits, and their peculiar fruits; but the God of TRUTH will not permit his unsophisticated image to be deluded by a pious fraud or a holy romance.—We may cry aloud, and cut ourselves with knives, and with lancets, till the blood gush out, but our labors are vain, our zeal is misguided. Elijah's God does not sit on a divided throne, with Cæsar. If we desire the burnt sacrifice to be consumed, and the

fire from heaven to lick up the water that is in the trench, the expanded mind and the enlarged soul must commune with its prototype, in a God, who claims, and must receive a homage, far transcending that due to the principalities and powers of earth. In every well balanced mind, a living faith must be a rational faith. It may transcend, but must never thwart the equally divine, though imperfectly developed functions of reason. Christianity is often derided for its puritanism, by the dissolute. This is a species of persecution which it may always expect to encounter, and from which it should never shrink, and is to be regarded as a healthy symptom. But when it is impeached by either open or covert infidelity, for its inferiority to that moral law which natural reason has established, it ought never to take umbrage in its mysteries, nor cant about the inability of the carnal mind to comprehend its ethical principles.

The practical infidelity here referred to, is no enemy to Christianity. It taxes itself to build her churches, support her ministers, and it upholds all her institutions, by its moral, as well as pecuniary patronage. But in all this, it is prompted by no higher motive than the expediency which the statesman sees in the cultivation of sobriety or honesty among the mass of the people. It is glad to see an effort made to unite the fragments of so much valuable morality into a system of public religion; but to an eye that commands the whole fabric, the *beau ideal* is wanting—the *tout ensemble*, the perfect whole is not there. Nothing is seen in the light she sheds, to induce men to glorify their Father which is in Heaven. She libelously charges the fault of her rejection, to the depravity of the human heart, never suspecting that the beam is in her own eye. Human nature and our religion are both deplorably fallen. The one is our misfortune, the other our fault. The one is a hereditary disease, the other a sovereign remedy, a heaven-prescribed specific. If it fails to effect a cure, the fault is neither in the disease nor in the remedy, for the one was adapted to the other in the secret counsels of Divine Wisdom, but it is in the empiricism of the administering physician, practised in the ecclesiastical laboratory.—Human nature and Christianity were alike perfect and holy when they came from the hands of their Author, but both are now sadly mutilated, and by the same means, and that means is the best, most comprehensive, and only perfect definition, of all the sin that has resulted from such mutilation, viz: SUBSTITUTING HUMAN EXPEDIENCY FOR DIVINE LAW. Whether the goodness for food of the fruit of the tree of life, its pleasantness to the eyes, and its desirableness to make one wise, were heavier in the balances of human expediency, when held by Eve, than were the attractive facinations which allured Christianity to rally under the *labarum*; or whether the serpent's jesuitism was

more subtle than Constantine's; are questions which we have no rational means of answering. Whether the one victim or the other, suffered the greater wreck in these two GRAND catastrophes, is a problem, which I must leave for those to solve who can carry their mathematics into the science of morals, but mine is limited to the science of quantity. I can demonstrate on the black-board, that the half loaf is better than no bread, but I cannot prove that a fifth-sixths honest man is either better or worse, greater or less than a knave, or that a deliberately nine-tenths Christian is either more or less orthodox than a confirmed reprobate. The fragments of a broken integrity, like those of a broken pitcher, may be pretty playthings to amuse children in the School of human expediency, but they are alike nugatory in the eyes of Him who says, "*be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.*" Our religion may carry her vulgar fractions into the sanctuary, and employ a narrow minded bigotry to cement them together. She may decimate her decalogue by expunging the commandment, "thou shalt not kill," adding to it, "unless in cases of wholesale murder," but unfortunately for such a religion, human sagacity shrinks back with instinctive infidelity and distrust, when it sees the broken arch in the bridge. Christianity has long been telling us, through the tradition of her elders, that she is at work purging the church of political iniquity, by her indirect influences; but the statistical tables shew that she has never yet gained any thing by this circumventive action, and it is devoutly to be hoped, for her own sake, that she never may. In the circumgyrations she has been making, round the citadel of political iniquity, she fancies that she is gradually dissolving the bands of wickedness, while to the eye of the spectator, she is only demonstrating her own duplicity, by exemplifying the principle, (as true in moral as in mechanical action,) that a body moving in a curvilinear path, is governed by a double impulse, and is striving to yield a conjoined obedience to its centripetal and its centrifugal deities.

I must not be understood to say that none but secondary minds embrace our religion. Facts would by no means warrant the assertion. Modern Christianity can justly number among her sincere votaries, intellectual stars of the first magnitude; minds that will ever be held in deserved veneration for profound and acute research in physical and metaphysical and some departments of moral science. Those minds, however, seem either to have overlooked, or purposely shrunk, with a kind of superstitious awe, from any other than an incidental side glance at the darkened corners of Christian science, which I am seeking to explore. Some of them have expended much ingenuity in building up theories of natural ethics, on some other than the gospel platform, not indeed directly adverse to it, but what is more pre-

suraptuous, independent of it. Aristotle defined virtue to be "the medium between two extremes." Those Christian Doctors who are so prone to sound the alarm of *ultraism*, would do well to enquire whether they are not indebted for this propensity, to the lore of the heathen dogmatist, built on this indefinite and fluctuating definition, rather than the inflexible and less popular lessons of Him who taught as one having authority.

The history of public opinion in Christendom, ever since the days of Constantine, has been a history of one continuous hubbub of the elements of our moral nature. It has not been a warfare between the flesh and the spirit. The gospel defines the parties belligerent and the weapons employed in conducting that war too accurately, and every one who surveys the battle field in his own breast, must understand its operations too easily to mistake its character. But the warfare to which I allude, is a battle royal, in which the attributes of the immortal spirit are struggling with each other. It is a combat between reason and religion—between devotion and philosophy—between living faith and Christian unity. The devastations of this warfare are seen in the schisms which have rent in fragments the once holy and unbroken church; in the oscillations of the human mind, to and fro, between implicit credulity and universal skepticism, between lifeless formality and senseless enthusiasm, between monastic superstition and proud infidelity. The human intellect, after awaking from the stupor of ages into which it had been thrown by the opiates of a crafty priesthood, revolts at an absurd Christianity, and seeks refuge in skepticism. After being whirled about in the giddy vortices of Cartesian philosophy, after reasoning the material world, and then itself, into the non-entities of a Berkeley and a Hume, it returns again in its uncouth career, a disconsolate and weary pilgrim, and again seeks repose in a religion, the utility of which it has learned to appreciate, and the deformities of which it endeavors to wink at, but a living or practical faith, in which it strives in vain to yield.

The doctrine first openly broached by Hobbes, and now advocated by our Henry Clays, that morality is a creature of legislative enactment, has often been cavilled with in theory, but oftener "sanctioned and sanctified" by Christian practice. Modern Christianity casts just light enough on the human mind to enable it to see her deformity. It exhibits moral beauty enough to enable us to see that it is a temple not made with hands, but the symmetry of its celestial architecture is marred by the chisel and the hammer of human ingenuity. Like the sun, laboring under an annular eclipse, it casts on our sublunary vision a faint and sickly ray, just enough to betray its native refulgence, and awaken the sympathies of nature to its deep humiliation.

The most desperate expedients have been employed to allay

this moral warfare. Human reason has been bound hand and foot, and flung as an oblation on the altar of peace. The free thinker is a denounced outlaw in church and state. Radicalism is sedition in politics; in religion, schism. The beauties of a theory are the sport of practical expediency in all the affairs of life. The unsophisticated youth, in opening his eyes on the world, and indulging his enthusiastic vision, in contemplating a *beau ideal* of moral beauty, is sarcastically rebuked by the maxims of prudence, the proverbs of age, and the sophisms of worldly wisdom, and every generous impulse of his soul is tamed down, till he can comprehend the logic of a sneer, and appreciate the poetry of a scowl. The meeting of extremes is proverbially a common place occurrence. In the bosom of the greatest liberty is cherished the most oppressive slavery, and the most malevolent misanthropy is sanctified by the most benevolent religion. If we could append the Mahometan's commentary on his Alcoran to our gospel, it would advance us one point, at least, in brotherly love, for while Christian is permitted to enslave Christian, it is not lawful for Turk to enslave Turk.

There is one master passion in the human heart, which has never been fully understood, nor properly rebuked, to which all the evils and inconsistencies I have hinted at, owe a filial regard. It is the love, or rather the lust of dominion. The leading object of Christianity was to subdue this passion. The other moral duties enjoined by the gospel, appeared quite rational, and were tolerably well understood by the light of nature. But it was the crucifixion of this hydra; it was the apparent solecism of the precept, *"he that exalleth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted,"* that more than any thing else, rendered the gospel a stumbling block to the Jews and to the Greek's foolishness. The disciples, themselves, were apparently very dull scholars in this branch of Christian Science. The mother of Zebedee's children was confounded at it. The disciples were amazed when he answered their question, who was the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, by setting a little child in the midst of them; nor could they comprehend the philosophy, which he illustrated by girding himself with a towel to wash their feet. A kingdom of this world, with all its pomps and vanities, upheld by military power and splendor, was constantly dancing before their vision. They were slow in learning that the meek should inherit the earth, or that the influence of moral purity, in its elementary simplicity, was more potent than legions of armies, and all the dazzling accompaniments with which a debased earthly court is surrounded. The great political secret which the Divine Tactician came to inculcate, was the substitution of moral truth for brute force and dumb show. His mode of warfare is not to controvert the strength

of animal muscles. Such irrelevant issues he leaves to be adjudicated in their appropriate tribunal, where tigers and wolves are suitors, and where the lion holds the office of chief justice by Divine appointment. His mode of battle is to paralyze the arm that has smitten one cheek, by turning the other also, and to hurl a thunderbolt home to the soul of his antagonist, in the shape of a blessing returned in exchange for a curse sent.—With the heavy artillery of heaven, he teaches us to storm the inmost citadel of the man, and awe the image of God into trembling submission, and instinctive homage to its Divine original. If the soldiers of the cross would but drill themselves in this martial exercise, and vie with each other in its heroic achievements, the promise that all power should be given them, would be speedily fulfilled, and they might, like Alexander, weep that there was no more worlds to conquer. God's omnipotence is copiously imparted to "the divinity that stirs within us." It is not only a communicable, but a highly contagious attribute.—The conquests which virtue makes over vice in the use of such weapons, though wielded by an arm of flesh, is but a different manifestation of that power which the prophet saw, when the tents of Cushan were in affliction, and the curtains of the land of Midian did tremble.

However hard and rare it may be for an individual, beset with his constitutional infirmities, and encompassed with his peculiar temptations, to acquire eminent strength and skill in the use of such armor, it is an easy thing for a nation, in its political capacity, and especially a republican nation, to do so, and to walk with God as literally as did Enoch of old. It is not an easy thing for a Christian to walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless; but it is an easy thing for him to say to his representative, "in ruling over men, thou must be just, ruling in the fear of God." It may be peculiarly hard for a minister of state to renounce his private sins; but it is peculiarly easy for him, (when conscious that the tenure of his office depends on it,) on ascending to the diplomatic desk, to say to his fellow minister, "my master in heaven, and my master on earth have both instructed me that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and that the solid glory of the nation which I represent, and the national honor, deemed by us immortal, and which must be preserved inviolate, consists in suffering wrong rather than doing wrong." If, instead of bullying each other like a brace of bloodthirsty duelists, our ministers would make the spirit of the gospel the basis of diplomatic negotiation, the most menacing symptoms of war would vanish, and the flourish of swords and daggers would subside with as little mischief, as resulted from the gusty controversy between Brutus and Cassius. The contest between us and Great Britain, now pending,

respecting the disputed Territory, would at once generate a dispute, who should accept it, and nation would vie with nation in diplomatic magnanimity, throughout the heathen as well as the Christian world.

One other view of this great subject, and I have done. It is a common maxim, that inasmuch as nations have no future state they are visited with condign punishment here. I am not aware of any canon in either natural or revealed theology, to support this opinion, other than the general principle that the councils of the wicked have in themselves the element of their own decomposition; that unless the moral law be changed, every human institution hostile to it, must, by an obvious necessity, have its old age and dissolution. But be this as it may, we certainly have neither scriptural nor common sense authority for the opinion, that the sins we commit in our social or political capacity, will meet with more indulgence in the day of judgment than our private and peculiar sins. However our optics may be mystified by the *legerdemain* of a monopoly, we cannot give iniquity a charter, make a dividend of the profits, and then tell the Almighty that it was the impersonal, the bodiless and soulless *it*, and not *we*, that sinned, and that Divine justice must wreak itself on a political fiction. We cannot, as stockholders in the national commonwealth, go to the polls, vote for a constitutional complement of directors, and through these directors wage war, enact or enforce slavery laws, and then say to the Almighty in the day when he shall make an inquisition for blood, "it was *it*, and not *we*, that slaughtered our brethren; it was *it*, and not *we*, that beat thy people to pieces, and ground the faces of the poor." The common law of all nations looks on each member of a conspiracy as guilty of all. Can we doubt that this righteous principle of justice is the common law of heaven also? If so, the patriotism of citizens which binds them together, when the nation violates God's law, is as false as the honor which prevails among a band of thieves, and as little available in the courts of Divine justice. Unless this rule can be impeached, every one slain in an unchristian war, is murdered, and every one who aids, assists or abets such a war by his suffrage or his countenance, is the murderer. There is one circumstance, too, which greatly aggravates the sins of the organized multitude, over that of the individual, it is the absence of a tempting motive. Judas may arise in the day of judgment, and condemn the electors of this nation, by saying to him that is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, that the thirty pieces of silver led him into temptation, but our ballot box sins are on speculation: he served the devil for ready pay—we, on credit.

It is owing to this want of perception of personal responsibility for our national sins, that many of the dispensations of Provi-

dence are accounted so mysterious. It seems hard, that for the perversity of Pharaoh, whose *sic volo* was law throughout the land of Egypt, that such sore calamities should have been dispensed to his passive subjects. If the wondrous exhibition of God's displeasure of political sin, had been confined to the tyrant and his privy council, it would not have seemed unreasonable; but that it should have extended to all his subjects—that God's wrath should have waxed hotter and hotter against Egypt, as its king's heart grew harder and harder, till the first-born was slain throughout the land, from the first-born of Pharaoh, that sat on the throne, to the first-born of the captive, that was in the dungeon—that his pursuing armies should have perished in the Red Sea—that these, and many such instances, should be recorded, where an unoffending people suffer, with divine approbation, for the political sins of their rulers, is generally considered one of the greatest mysteries of the Bible. But if we remember that the privilege of yielding supreme obedience to God, is a reserved right, which he will not permit us to compromise, in entering into the political compact; that each for himself, must, without taking counsel of circumstances, or political emergencies, or a corrupted public opinion, in all cases, obey God rather than man, wherever we see a divergency of their authority; if we remember also, that even in the most despotic governments, the bone and sinew, and majesty of political power, is made up of the bone and sinew and moral influence of those who are loyal to such power, all mystery vanishes. Every human being, even in the most despotic governments, is held responsible for the righteous exercise of his physical power and moral influence, (even if he have no other political capital,) and is required to withhold them from his sovereign, whenever they would be perverted to the commission of political iniquity.— Besides these items of political capital, common to all mankind, we electors, in our highly favored and highly responsible country, are vested, each for himself, with an aliquot share of the absolute and uncontrollable sovereign power itself. For the righteous exercise of all these powers, (or of such of them as we may be vested with,) each one is morally responsible, irrespective of the discipline of his party, the commands of his king, or the laws of his country. The distinction set up between political and individual sin, will not bear the simplest analytical test. We may as well excuse ourselves from moral responsibility for sins committed in our conjugal, our filial or our paternal, as in our political capacity. We are neither required nor allowed to take up carnal weapons, in defeating the political sins of our country, nor for any other purpose than in obedience to the first law of nature, self-defence, and this only in cases of extreme physical necessity; but we are required to set at defiance all hu-

man law, in withholding our physical powers, and in actively opposing with all our moral and political power, such measures of our government as swerve from what we believe to be the law of perfect holiness, and it is only by taking this course, that each one can acquit himself of *personal* responsibility for the *political* sins of his country.

Let me not be misunderstood. When I speak of opposing every law which deviates from perfect holiness, I mean such laws or political measures as are intrinsically or theoretically unholy, or whose end and aim is at some point, other than that of absolute perfection, so far as they have a moral character. But we must not confound an imperfect design, with that imperfection which betrays the erring hand of every thing human in the execution. It is one thing to adopt as a rule of action the theory that a human being shall, (in the language of slavery's code,) "be taken, deemed and reputed to be a chattel personal, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever," and another thing to fail, in the perfect execution, of the political design of equal protection, and meting out exact and impartial justice to all. It is one thing in the eyes of the searcher of hearts, designedly to manufacture a false balance, and another, to fail in making one so perfectly true as to enable us to weigh the rays of light. The partial evil, the incidental injustice, and the occasional oppression, growing out of the inherent imperfection of human laws and human administration of perfect laws, are rather to be ranked among the imperfections of our nature, for which we are not responsible, than to be condemned as moral evils. They bear as little resemblance to slavery laws, or a law declaring offensive war, as does the accidental glance of the woodman's axe, to the designed stroke of the deadly guillotine.

Many of our casuists speak of *political* evils, in contradistinction to *moral*, forgetting that the only proper correlative of political, is individual. For example, there is a class of abolitionists, (so calling themselves,) who deny slavery to be a moral, but admit it to be a political evil, and propose its removal by purchasing of the master the liberation of the slave. Now according to my logic, this proposition is a manifest solecism. If slavery is not a moral evil, the only remaining question is for individuals to settle, whether it is a secular evil, or, in other words, a pecuniary disadvantage. But the proposed measure of compensating the master, supposes that it is not, and consequently, instead of seeking its discontinuance, the statesman ought to encourage and protect it, equally with every other class of legitimate interests. The great end, and as I conceive, the only proper office of government, is to extend impartial protection to every man, in his individual rights, among which is the pursuit of any vocation not productive of moral evil, which he may select, and those

only are *political evils* which impede the execution of this function.

There is no doubt but that the world has ever been governed too much—that legislative power, in all its forms, has a strong propensity to extend its dominion beyond the limits of legitimate legislation. With this evil, the Christian moralist ought not, as such, to interfere, only in resisting its encroachments on divine law. In all the other usurpations, he ought for the sake of peace, not only to render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, (but to a very great extent at least) those he claims to be his. When the legislature undertakes to regulate by statute the length of a coat skirt, or to limit the height of a heel-pike, as they did in England under the reign of Edward the 4th, it is unquestionably the duty of the Christian to obey, however he may, as a politician, strive to have so contemptible a badge of despotic power expunged from the statute books of his country.

Political tyranny is very often confounded with slavery. But they have very little resemblance to each other—hardly enough to rescue from literary criticism the trite metaphor employed in popular harangue, that the subjects of a despot are a nation of slaves. The monarchical theory of government, is based on the principle that the king is the source and fountain of political power, and consequently, the popularity or unpopularity of a measure of the government is reduced to a mere item in the scales of legislative expediency. The severity of despotic power is inversely proportioned to the influence which public opinion has in the exercise of those discretionary powers constitutionally lodged in the breast of the sovereign. But the most reckless and wanton abuse of this power, is limited in its nature, to the exaction of arbitrary taxes, levied against the will of the subject, to support the magnificence of a court, the dignity of the crown, or advance some other political interest, all of which are legitimate subjects of legislation. Despotism is therefore merely the abuse of those constitutional powers which, according to the monarchical theory of government, are rightfully lodged in the breast of the king. But slavery is very different in its element, its object and its end. The slaveholder's power has not the most remote connection with political power. He may himself be the subject of an absolute despotism, the subject or a member of a hereditary aristocracy, or a citizen of a republic, and his relation to his slave remains unchanged. Slavery is a mere personal or private relation between two human beings. It is the relation between the proprietor and his property, and has no more connection with the affairs of state, than the relation between the peasant and his donkey. Its element is impersonality or chattelship in the slave, and consequently, it supposes no oppression to remove, no encroachment on the rights of man, to re-

exist, no bereavement of parental, conjugal or other domestic relations to redress, because it supposes that there is no man to oppress, no rights to encroach, no domestic ties to rend. Despotism is the perversion of constitutional power—slavery, the annihilation of personal rights. The one exacts an unreasonable portion of the earnings of industry, in order to sustain the supposed dignity of the nation—the other appropriates the whole physical, moral and intellectual man, in order to satiate the cravings of individual cupidity. The character of the one, depends on the circumstances of time, place, occasion, and all other elements which enter into the science of complicated political expediency—the other is as unchanging in its character as the laws of God, which it violates, and the innate rights of man, which it swallows up.

In wading through the ponderous folios of human legislation, from the rescripts and pandects of the Roman Emperors to the statutes of republican America, much folly, much exercise of arbitrary power is seen, but the Christian moralist will be at a loss to put his finger on more than the two moral sins of war and slavery, which nations, in their political capacity, have ever committed. Blackstone defines municipal law to be "a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right, and prohibiting what is wrong." With the exception of these two sins, this definition has, under all the abuses of despotic power, been the recognized guide of the most corrupt legislation. These are, in the nature of things, the only sins which political power, in its most greedy desire of dominion, is under any temptation of committing. In these remarks, I do not intend to commit myself on the vexed question, how far the legislature ought to restrain intemperance, licentiousness or other immoralities not definitely aggressive on the natural rights of others, and not rising in enormity to the height of public nuisances.

In discussing the subject of this chapter, I conceive that I have, without specially designing it, committed myself on the question now being agitated among abolitionists, respecting the expediency of organizing themselves into a separate political party. The objections to this measure are all based on the very natural belief, that political power must always remain corrupt, because it always has been—that if our high and holy enterprise is carried on through a party organization, it must necessarily become tainted with the pestiferous moral atmosphere which surrounds the ballot-box—that even if we should escape contagion, our reputation will suffer, and consequently our moral influence, in promoting the cause will be scathed—that we must take men as they are, and not as they should be.—To my mind, these last objections savor much of the jesuitism

against which we are warring. Let us rather take God as He is, and His truth as it is revealed to us, and rely on that, and that alone, to make men as they should be, and leave the influences and consequences of our doing so to be moulded by the hand of a superintending Providence. If the view here taken of the rise, the progress, the debasement and check of Christian truth, be correct, the pathway of duty is luminous with experience. Clothed as we are by the grace of God, with a portion of the sovereign power, let us not tie it up in a napkin, but let us in exercising it in His fear, exhibit an apostolic unity of counsel and of action. Let us above all things beware of rallying round the *labarum*, instead of the *true cross*, by fastening our holy cause to the car of a sub-treasury or an anti-sub-treasury party. Let us learn from the secular parties of the day the only maxim of Christian politics which they cultivate, that a house divided against itself cannot stand. Nor let our heart faint because our numbers are yet few. We are either laboring under a great delusion, or we are striving to span a fundamental truth of Christian faith, too big for a mind shrivelled and shrunken and corroded by our mongrel religion to comprehend. Let us, till undeceived, confide in the omnipotence of truth, and the moral sublimity of our principles, nor let us compare its progress with that of Calvinism or Lutheranism, or Armenianism, or any other *isms* that have sprung out of the acrid schisms and fragments of a fractured and frangible Christianity; but let us seek for a parallel for truth in truth, for purity in purity, and confide in the perfect assurance that, with a Christianity of 24 carats fine, as great wonders may be wrought in the 19th, as in the 2d and 3d centuries. Let us remember that our truth is not like whig truth or anti-whig truth, that needs an infusion of falsehood and deception to help its propagation; but it is, in the language of its author, like the grain of mustard seed which the man took and sowed in his field: it is like the leaven which the woman took and hid in three measures of meal. Let us be instant in season and out of season, in propagating this truth. Let those that fear the Lord speak often one to another about it. Let us adjourn our meetings from the church to the polls, from the *sanc-tum* to the *sanctum sanctorum*. Let our forces be there arrayed, in the oneness of that truth which binds us together. Let us there provoke its discussion. Let the American eagle in our handbill bear the motto, "BREAK EVERY YOKE—LET THE OPPRESSED GO FREE." Let us carefully avoid disgracing ourselves in the face of heaven and earth, by nominating or voting for a "*five-sixths*" abolitionist, but let our candidate be an unbroken unit, not only on the slavery, but the peace, the temperance, and every other question, in which we believe the councils of this nation are tainted with moral impurity. In casting about for an avail-

ble candidate, let our nominating caucus, instead of enquiring who sings the best Bacchanalian song, be deeply conversant with the maxim which hung upon the dying lips of an ancient political adventurer, who was promoted from the office of feeder of his father's flocks to that of king of God's chosen people: "*The spirit of the Lord,*" says he, "*spake by me, and his word was in my tongue; the God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, 'HE THAT RULETH OVER MEN MUST BE JUST, RULING IN THE FEAR OF GOD.'*"

With a ticket thus made out, and regulated in every department of action, by such policy, we can soon undeceive a much abused, a grossly libelled public opinion, and the common mind, in its unsophisticated and rural simplicity, will distance our Gamaliels and our Solons, in church and state, in casting off that prejudice, now resting on the grandeur of our enterprise, and the feasibility of its execution.

If we are only faithful to our principles, we need not wait for time or tide or occasion, but we may take men as they are, as God has made them, and apply to their minds and consciences, truth, as He has adapted it to these minds and consciences, and it will bring forth its fruits as abundantly now as it did 1600 years ago. Our numbers are fast increasing, and will continue to increase in geometrical progression, (for that is the ratio by which such truth moves,) unless we again make shipwreck on the same shoals where Christianity was stranded in the days of Eusebius, and an exchange be made of purity for patronage, of principle for numbers, a substitution be effected of human expediency for heavenly wisdom, and a coalition formed between a corrupt ambition and Christian truth. Instead of bending from our high principles to form such an alliance, instead of being diverted from a straight line in the pursuit of our glorious purpose, let us say to these professed helpers, but real hinderers, as Nehemiah did to Sanballad and Gashem on a similar occasion, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down; why should the work cease whilst I leave it and come down to you?" We may rely on it, that politicians will soon find it expedient to come up to our principles, when they are convinced that we will not descend to theirs.

Human expediency has already begun its old trade, in seeking to split the difference with us, and some of our numbers have been decoyed from the ranks. We may expect to lose many more in the same way, in its further approximations, but this is no cause of despondency. To my mind, the rule by which political expediency moves, is as clearly seen as that of moral duty. We are all more familiar with the laws by which the flood-wood is moved than those by which the tide is raised, and under the present state of things, we have sufficient data to speak propheti-

cally of results. The two organized parties are, fortunately for us, so equally balanced, and as a consequence of that circumstance, so bitterly hostile to each other, that a third party, anchored immovably at the rock of moral principle, and having but sufficient numerical force to equal the difference between the belligerent parties, would I conceive, by an invariable rule of expediency, draw to it the lesser party, all extraneous circumstances being left out of the account. Though there are many pro-slavery prejudices that would rise against such a project, there are few in these northern states but would be more than counterbalanced by those towards the adverse party, and these few would be balanced a hundred fold, by the multitude, that would leap from the fetters of the other party, to cast their vote for the slave, without the fear of "throwing it away," as it is now considered. Under such circumstances too, the party tacticians would not have to sin against the so much lauded virtue of "*consistency*"—a virtue which is evidently intended to adorn the ethics of the instinctive, rather than the deliberative tribes of animated nature. The Tariff question is disposed of, the National Bank question is disposed of, (for the present, at least,) and it is to be hoped the long agitated Sub-Treasury question will be disposed of during the present session of Congress.—These *major* questions all being settled, the defeated party, (whichever it may be,) will have a beautiful opportunity of taking up what has long been considered the "*minor* question" of human chattelship, and will adopt resolutions in accordance with ours, at their party meetings. This will result in the national issue of slavery and liberty, so far as federal jurisdiction extends, a political issue that ought to have been joined long ago.

So long as either party considers a defeat of the adverse party more important than the slavery question, it is only speculating on the dereliction of a party candidate from his principles, to expect him to represent ours. Nearly all northern men are, and always were, abolitionists, when it does not interfere with party discipline; but as both parties are equally interlinked with slavery through their national organization, it is hoping against impossibilities, to expect a representative of either party, to be true to his own partizans, and to us also. The practice of questioning candidates, seems to me equally embarrassing to the honest candidate and elector, and calculated to entrap the conscience, and compromise the principles of both. If it be true, that no man can serve two masters, it must be doubly true, that no candidate can be a faithful representative of a party whose existence is bound up in slavery, and a party whose sole bond of union is the destruction of slavery.

It is feared that when our ranks are thus increased, so as to

render abolitionism a good office-seeking policy, and a majority of our numbers are more governed by these motives than a conscientious hatred of slavery, that we must of necessity be debased to the ordinary standard of partisan morality. This I conceive, is not a legitimate sequence. There may be as many unprincipled politicians and dishonest men in our ranks as in that of our opponents. Nine-tenths of our party may be of this class, and yet the party may be perfectly upright. Such are the advantages of virtue over vice; that the other tenth may govern them, and through them the nation. The magical tactics, through which this miracle is performed under our democratic institutions, are in the rigid and uniform application of the long disused maxim which should be restored to its place in the *vade mecum* of every freeman and Christian—"Never surrender the helm of conscience to party discipline, nor sacrifice principle to conservatism." If all the honest men in our country would but adopt this maxim, and hold themselves in the attitude of "throwing away their votes, and disfranchising themselves," as it is absurdly called, whenever their party swerved from the line of moral rectitude, all power would be subjected at once to their control. There is, I doubt not, tenfold more virtue in public sentiment, (debased as this nation appears to be,) than is necessary to bring its councils within the pale of perfect rectitude, if it were but properly husbanded, and the jesuitical spirit of conservatism could only be expelled. True moral conservatism is, in the abstract, neither a means nor an end, but an incident, and follows truth as faithfully as the shadow follows the substance. This is undoubtedly the politics of heaven. In human affairs, this harmony is disturbed by the warring elements of individual interest, and unreasoning personal prejudice. These we can never be too forward in compromising, or even sacrificing on the altar of conservatism. But that kind of conservatism which asks the higher sacrifice of an *iota* of moral principle, is a conspiracy against which every good man should set his face as a flint.

Many worthy abolitionists shudder at the thought of a political association with the corrupt and unprincipled. This I conceive to be a delicacy which should be subdued. As *citizens*, we have as little to do with the *motives* of the anti-slavery politician, as we have with the motives of those who refrain from theft through policy rather than principle. All we have a right to ask, in either case, is correct *action*. The sphere of the *political* moralist is limited to the *overt act*—that of the *social* moralist, reaches the *intention*. The office of the one is to teach human expediency that righteousness is profitable in all things—that of the other, to inculcate and cherish the more heroic virtue of cutting off the right hand, or plucking out the right eye, when they offend.

In carrying on this revolution, we must expect to beat against and athwart the currents and counter currents of a sordidly utilitarian age. The nearer we draw to us expediency, in its approximations towards the line of duty, the more severely our principles will be tested. The more auspicious the popular breeze, the more intently must the helmsman's eye be bent on his chart. This is a trial through which, (according to my theory,) christianity has not yet passed. We have no canonical example to guide us in the crisis. The apostles fell victims in the anti-discussion or brick-bat stage of the war between moral truth and political power. We have nothing but the beacon light of the ever to be lamented *Eusebian* age, and the very minute description St. Paul gives of the panoply of Christian armor with which he so earnestly insists the soldiers of the cross must be harnessed, when they wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Were I to venture on a somewhat conjectural speculation on the final results of this struggle, I should say, that if in that soul-trying day, there be enough of us, shutting our eyes and ears to the alluring proffer of great political gain, for an almost imperceptible aberration from principle, to throw the party into the minority by quitting it, the nation is safe; otherwise, the experiment is a failure.

Jefferson thought, that the price of liberty was eternal vigilance; whether this is to be the price of national morality, when once attained, is a problem which time only can solve. But being once organized, let us not disband till HOLINESS TO THE LORD be the label of our statute books, and the directory of our executive councils—till our courts of justice shall execute judgment in the morning, and deliver him that is spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor. Instead of abandoning the deeply degraded and justly derided American ballot box, to a band of political intriguants, to be perverted by them into a wheel of fortune, let us see in it a moral engine, more powerful than the lever of Archimedes, with which deeds, such as the earth has never yet beheld, are to be done in the name of the Lord, and through the mighty instrumentality of which, a nation is to be born in a day. On the arrival of that eventful era, much new knowledge will, in speedy succession, be unfolded to our enraptured vision. Our apostate race will then have, for the first time, some practical data, to enable us to determine, whether the winged seraph that took with the tongs a live coal from off the altar, and touched the previously unclean lips of Isaiah, was commissioned by the God of TRUTH or the spirit of empty bombast—whether out of Zion shall indeed go forth law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem—whether he shall judge among the nations, and shall re-

buke many people, until they shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks, and nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more—whether the mountain of the Lord's house shall indeed be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it—whether any thing better is meant by kings becoming nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers, than the triumphs of European despots, under the name of the Holy alliance, in riding over the necks of an oppressed people, partly through the ancillary influence of the gospel of peace, and partly through the agency of the thundering cannon, the bristling bayonet and the rampant war-horse—whether the message from Him, whose eyes are as a flame of fire, and whose feet are as fine brass, to the angel of the church in Thyatira, promising power over the nations, as a reward for overcoming and for keeping His works unto the end, is a responsible promise or not—whether, in short, the many ancient covenants which stud the pages of holy writ, and which have been so long in abeyance, announcing the joyful influence of the gospel on the political institutions of the nations embracing it, are in fact any thing more than mere “rhetorical flourishes” of the pen of inspiration.

But we can already walk by sight as well as by faith, in this highway. Though yet the day of small things, the stately stepplings of moral truth are seen in our own time as well as in days of yore. When the six Quakers held their first political caucus in the city of London, on the memorable 7th of July, 1783, “to consider what steps they should take for the relief and liberation of the negro slaves in the West Indies, and for the discouragement of the slave trade on the coast of Africa,” it took them several years to earn the reputation of fanatics, in consequence of their apparent insignificance. This was the first war waged by Christianity against political iniquity, since she had access to the ear of Cæsar, and is an epoch deeply niched in the chronological tables of eternity. Instead of twelve, there were but six incendiary apostles, that with their “*execrable superstition*,” undermined the councils of British, as their predecessors did of Roman wisdom. They had, too, obstacles of equal, and in many respects, very similar character to contend with. The public opinion of Christendom was against them. The commercial interests of the nation, both in and out of parliament, was considered staked in the question. Their government, too, composed of a rotten borough apology for democracy in one house, a titled independent nobility in the other, and a hereditary monarch on the throne, was very far from being such a mirror of public sentiment as ours. The hard handed and honest hearted laborer, whose sympathies for the oppressed are always most easily moved, had no political capital that could be enlisted in

the cause. In the opinion of Lord North, then Premier, the slave trade had, in a commercial point of view, become necessary to all the maritime powers of Europe. Under this state of things, six obscure, unlearned, ineloquent members of a despised and politically proscribed sect, meet to devise a scheme by which the commerce of nations was to be arrested, and the moral world revolutionized. Supposing at their first meeting, one of our Smiths, or Stauntons, or Stewarts, or Garrisons, or Tappans, had, in his wildest hallucinations, stepped into their little conventicle, and heard their plans concocted, their ways and means devised, would he not have shaken his head at such mountain-removing faith, such demented *ultraism*? Would he not have said to them, "your theory is very beautiful, your '*abstractions*' are sublime, "*but*," would he not have added, (in the language of a John Q. Adams abolitionist,) "*but*—public opinion is against you—you must take men as they are, and not as they should be." Such logic as this, would have been thrown away upon such minds. The "*one idea*" which constituted the much learning that made St. Paul mad, filled their souls. The monomania which prompted Abraham to rise up early in the morning and saddle his ass, and take his son Isaac and the cloven wood into the land of Moriah, afflicted them.

What was the result? They persevered in their active labors, unnoticed and almost unknown, till their abstractions expanded the mind of a Clarkson and a Wilberforce. Through their agency, the fermentation of the leaven was soon made obvious. The press became trumpet-tongued to the nation's conscience. Petitions were poured in to parliament. Worldly power began to tremble. All the machinations that human wisdom could devise, were called into active requisition, to put down what the oracles of the British Senate discovered to be a "hypocritical fanatic and methodistical spirit." The battle grew hotter and hotter. The maddened genius of despotism was thrown into a paroxysm of rage. Cupidity lashed herself into a foam. The seers of political expediency, from Lord Chancellor Thurlow on his woolsack, to the hangman at Newgate, saw in prophetic vision, the future pass before them, in rivers of blood, massacres, ruin to the colonies, reduction to the nation's revenue, decay in her naval strength, and bankruptcy to her merchants. Lord John Russell denounced the project as "visionary and delusive." The Duke of Clarence, who, afterwards as William the 4th, immortalized his reign by giving the royal sanction to the law abolishing slavery throughout the British empire, discovered, when in the House of Lords, that Wilberforce and his associates, were a band of "hypocrites and fanatics," and Lord Castlereagh, as late as 1807, in declaring the whole counsels of God against this formidable rebel to public

opinion and good order, stood between the dragon and his wrath, with the word of God in his hand and made a labored speech, vindicating the slave trade on scriptural grounds. Nor did he stand alone in his struggle, for this article of Christian orthodoxy. As early as 1788, (probably the occasion to which Hannah More refers,) a pamphlet entitled "slavery no oppression," was brought forth by a venal Christianity; and in the same year, the Rev. R. Harris was the first to have his name formally canonized in slavery's calendar of saints, by writing a work entitled "Scriptural Researches on the Licentiousness [liberty] of the Slave Trade, shewing its conformity with the principles of Natural and Revealed Religion, delineated in the Writings of the Word of God." Ten times did the untiring spirit of Wilberforce struggle with a martyr's zeal, for the passage of his obnoxious bill to suppress the traffic, and ten times were his mighty efforts frustrated. Like an illustrious champion in the primitive stages of the same warfare, he was troubled on every side, yet not distressed—perplexed, but not in despair—persecuted, but not forsaken—cast down, but not destroyed. The strife was a mortal one, between truth and error, between divine wisdom and human expediency, between the sublime abstractions and the concrete tangibilities. At length, the powers of darkness began to give way. The political weathercocks began to turn, and Fox and Pitt were made friends, and on the 25th of March, 1807, the bill to abolish the slave trade, was passed, and thus were exhibited the first fruits of the grain of mustard twenty-four years after it had been planted by the ~~six~~ Quakers. Continental Europe was next to be inoculated with the fanaticism. After a series of protracted diplomacy, treaty after treaty was effected, till in 1830, every Christian nation in Europe and America, prohibited the accursed traffic. In the mean time, the war is carried into the very citadel of despotic power, and slavery itself is next assailed with the thunderbolts of truth. Never was a more striking instance seen of the rampancy of despotism. She clung to vitality with a more than feline tenacity, and exhibited instead of nine lives, ninety times nine. At length her requiem was chaunted, and on the first day of August, 1834, the sun, for the first time, looked upon an empire on which he never sets, and saw—NO SLAVE.

Here the green curtain drops on the tragedy of British slavery, and on a short interlude follows the afterpiece. The corse of the demon, yet quivering with life, is consigned to the Provincial authorities, with £20,000,000, sterling, to defray the expenses of a decent interment, out of respect to the feelings of surviving friends. A desperate effort is made to resuscitate the body under the apprenticeship system. The Kingston despatch is chartered by the agents and understrappers, which, in con-

nection with the political, religious and literary presses of republican America, (with a precious few honorable exceptions,) organizes into one grand galvanic battery, to restore the vital spark to the dead carcass; but in vain. The Promethean fire had fled forever, and only a few horrible contortions and ghastly smiles could be produced. In the mean while, the seventh seal was seen to open, by the priests of Dagon, throughout our country. The heavens were hung in black. Negro carnage and cut-throating appeared in prophetic vision, as brilliant as an Oswego *aurora borealis*, to dance their gambols, in the form of free slaves. The Post-Master General saw a sign in the heavens which he deemed a sufficient voucher to warrant his directing the New-York and Charleston post offices to exclude intelligence, saying, that under the circumstances, "it was patriotism do disregard the laws." Old Hickory, himself, learned for the first time, what was the true definition of *fear*, and recommended congress to gag the press, by submitting the contents of the mailbag to the inspection and censorship of the votaries of slavery. Gov. Marcy's religious qualms got the better of his statesmanship, and he hinted to the legislature the necessity there might be of enacting penal laws, to prevent us fanatics writing or printing any thing about the rights of man, in defiance of the two constitutions, while he and they had just taken their lips from the Bible, in their oath to support. The gag democratic of Pinckney, of Hawes, of Patton, of Atherton, and of Johnson, were successively invented, as ligaments to keep the Union together, and exhibit to an admiring world the hitherto unknown mode of governing a free people, and of exhibiting the moral beauties of that *last hope of man*, the confederation of twenty-six free and independent republics. The colonization society had long before discovered that the freed negro, though heaven's selected missionary to evangelize Africa, was, in any other vocation, the "vilest of the vile," and if liberated faster than consecrated and missionated, our blessed land would be overrun with

"A multitude, like which the barb'rous North,
Poured never from her frozen loins, to pass
Rhene or the Danaw."

But when she saw 800,000 freed in a day, she "trembled from her entrails," and "gave signs of woe that all was lost." Expurgated and mutilated editions of English literature were ordered for the South. Lynch clubs were organized, and in fine, such *tragi-comic* scenes were enacted, in state and church, in sock and buskin, as might well move a Democritus to deride, and a Heraclitus to deplore the vices and vanities, the perversities and pomposities, of poor, infirm, purposely deluded humanity.

In the mean while, the truth has been advancing, conquering and to conquer. The British nation having become surcharged

with it, her religious, her social; her literary, her political, her commercial relations with the world, are so many conductors, through which she is electrizing the nations of the earth. Infidel France, her ancient enemy, has yielded to the potency of her moral influence, and is now taking efficient and radical measures to abolish slavery in the colonial members of her empire. Every steam-ship sent across the Atlantic, is a flaming "incendiary" to the tottering empire of American slavery. British aristocracy is inflicting on mortified American democracy, lessons as unwelcome as they are philosophical, on the inalienable rights and essential equality of man. And that same city, which, fifty-seven years ago, witnessed the meeting of the six Quakers within her suburbs, is about to be coronated with a diadem, imperishable as that Christian philanthropy, whose congregated representatives, from the round world, are to assemble within her borders, and officiate at the sublime gala.

But amid all the incongruities here pointed out, and the thousand others with which the pathway of the moralist and the statesman is beset, I must, in closing these deeply interesting but too hasty reflections, indulge the fond hope that the fulness of the times is fast drawing nigh—that in the very rottenness and corruption which enshrouds the political and religious institutions of mankind, a seminal principle has already germinated, and is fast putting itself forth in vernal beauty, and is big with promise of perennial strength, and millennial glory—that the Spirit of God is now brooding on the face of the chaotic deep, and is teaching his vicegerent on earth, HUMAN REASON, to resume the full and harmonious exercise of all her long lost and profanely derided functions—that this self-balanced principle, baptized into the transcendent, but not inharmonious truth, as it is in Jesus, is beginning to upheave the foundations of that vast mountain of error and sin, with which Christendom, and with it humanity, has been oppressed for fifteen centuries, and will yet bear a mighty tide of saving health to all nations—that the oneness of that truth, in its variegated aspects and material certainties, will yet be seen, eye to eye, by all her meek and single-minded votaries—that that confirmed demon, the anti-discussion spirit, alike abhorrent to God and man, will yet be exorcised, not only from the church, but from the human family, and colonized in his own appropriate home and fatherland, among the beasts that roam the howling wilderness—that those prejudices, which seek to set bounds to the Catholicism of human sympathy and brotherly love, and to canton out the human family into grades and castes, irrespective of that dignity and worth which are weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, will yet be tested in the crucible of apostolic orthodoxy—that God will yet teach all His children: that He is verily no respecter of persons, and that it is with a

high hand, and worse than Atheistical heart, that we, who are favored with His revealed word, break both of the two great commandments, when we blasphemously impeach the goodness of His own handiwork, and cruelly sneer at a brother whom He has made in His own likeness, because enveloped in a different colored skin from ours—that in the indulgence of brute caprice, our aversions and antipathies must at least be limited to cats and dogs, and other creatures made for our “sport and gust,” but that we must love our neighbor, not with that kind of love bestowed on a favorite horse or spaniel, but as ourselves, as a compeer standing on the same exalted platform of humanity—that we will yet be taught our own heart and the golden rule, well enough, to see, that the kind of love which looks down with affected pity on an innocent brother, and speculates on his assumed degradation, is felt by its recipient, in every virtuous mind, to be but another name for *hate*, in its most cruel type—that the ploughshare of truth will yet tear up the foundations of that bastard philosophy, built on the assumed debasement of one tribe of the human family below another—that the sword of the spirit will yet be sheathless, and two edged, in the hands of a ministry, having an adequate unction of the spirit of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, to assail iniquity in her high places, rampant with political power, and with the heroism of a Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, to trample under foot those anti-godly statutes which forbid an African child being taught to read his Bible, and which requires the ambassador of Christ, in miserable truculency, to keep back from the victims of oppression, that portion of His councils which are redolent of liberty. The spirit of the times calls loudly for witnesses, who, when arraigned for violating such laws, can intrepidly step into the criminal box, and say to the public prosecutor, representing the sovereignty of earthly legislation, “we are not careful to answer thee in this matter, O king.” In case the approaching crisis calls for the testimony of such witnesses, the same God who, on a less needed occasion, raised up a Ridley, a Cranmer, and a Latimer, will doubtless provide His church with a noble army of martyrs, worthy of her fundamental truth, which they may have the immortal honor of sealing with their blood. But whether such sacrifices are to be made or not, the moral warfare now raging between truth and error, is evidently never to be compromised. The time is at hand, when it will be practically conceded, that all truth, lying within the firmament of the human mind, is so affiliated, that its discussion, whether in physics or metaphysics, in religion or in politics, will be invited rather than interdicted, by every faithful servant of God who is ambitious of doubling the one, the two, or the five talents confided to him—that human expediency, like the prodigal son who has so long been wasting his substance

with riotous living in a far country, will yet return, as penitent as pennyless, to the ancient homestead, where there is bread enough, and will find the task as pleasing as it is profitable, to yield implicit obedience to the commands of his Heavenly Father.

In worshipping God with all our minds, a philosophy will yet be found in the volume of Revelation, profound as the ocean, but transparent as a sea of glass, which all will delight to explore.— In worshipping Him with all our soul, a poetry will be evinced, sweeter than the harp of Orpheus, and harmonious as the music of the spheres. which none will be incapable of appreciating—that this philosophy and this poetry will re-elevate the once angelic nature of man to an eminent height above the debasing sensualities of his bestial nature, in which he has been unfortunately submerged by his original apostacy—that Christianity, instead of being of the stunted and churlish growth it has exhibited these last fifteen centuries, keeping but little more than equal pace with Mahometanism in its progress, instead of being a forced hot bed plant, it will yet blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing—the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, and the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.

ALABAMA

HOUSTON

WYATT